arXiv:1611.05981v1 [math.AG] 18 Nov 2016

ORBIFOLD STABILITY AND MIYAOKA-YAU INEQUALITY FOR MINIMAL PAIRS

by

Henri Guenancia & Behrouz Taji

Abstract. — After establishing suitable notions of stability and Chern classes for singular pairs, we use Kähler-Einstein metrics with conical and cuspidal singularities to prove the slope semistability of orbifold tangent sheaves of minimal log-canonical pairs of log general type. We then proceed to prove the Miyaoka-Yau inequality for all minimal pairs with standard coefficients. Our result in particular provides an alternative proof of the Abundance theorem for threefolds that is independent of positivity results for tangent sheaves.

Contents

1. Introduction 1
2. Preliminaries on orbifolds sheaves, Chern classes and stability 5
3. Behaviour of Chern classes and stability under change of orbi-structures 12
4. Semistability of the orbifold tangent sheaf 18
5. Orbifold Miyaoka-Yau inequality for minimal pairs 27
References 29

1. Introduction

In 1954 Calabi conjectured that a compact complex manifold with negative first Chern class $c_1(X) < 0$ admits a Kähler-Einstein metric. This conjecture was famously settled by Aubin [**Aub78**] and Yau [**Yau78**] leading to many remarkable applications in algebraic geometry. An important consequence was the celebrated Miyaoka-Yau inequality:

$$\big(2(n+1)\cdot c_2(X) - n\cdot c_1^2(X)\big)\cdot(-c_1(X))^{n-2} \geqslant 0, \tag{1.1}$$

where $n = \dim(X)$.

Henri Guenancia is partially supported by NSF Grant DMS-1510214. Behrouz Taji was partially supported by the DFG-Graduiertenkolleg GK1821 "Cohomological Methods in Geometry" at Freiburg.

The first main result of the current paper is the generalization of Inequality (1.1) to the case of all minimal models.

Theorem A. — **(The Miyaoka-Yau inequality for minimal models)**
Any minimal model of dimension n verifies the Miyaoka-Yau inequality:

$$\big(2(n+1)\cdot c_2(X) - n\cdot c_1^2(X)\big)\cdot(-c_1(X))^{n-2} \geqslant 0, \tag{1.2}$$

A minimal model X is a normal complex projective variety with only terminal singularities whose canonical divisor is a $\mathbb{Q}$-Cartier nef divisor. According to standard results and conjectures in the Minimal Model Program minimal varieties exist, at least conjecturally, in the birational class of any non-uniruled projective manifold. More generally, such objects are studied in the *logarithmic category* where a projective variety X is considered together with a divisor D such that $(K_X + D)$ is nef and (X, D) has only "mild" singularities. Naturally one would like to generalize the inequality (1.1) in this setting.

Generalization of Miyaoka-Yau inequalities have attracted a lot of attention over the last thirty years, with major contributions due to Tsuji, R.Kobayashi, Tian-Yau, Simpson, Megyesi, Y.Zhang, Song-Wang, Greb, Kebekus, Peternell together with the second author, to cite only a few. We have tried to render a brief account of these contributions in the last section of the introduction.

One of the remaining cases of interest for this inequality is that of log canonical pairs (X, D) where $K_X + D$ is nef. Here the situation gets significantly more complicated; even when defining the correct notion for Chern classes. In fact in the most general setting, where all possible rational coefficients for D is allowed, it is not even clear how one should define higher Chern classes. However, in the two cases considered in Theorem B below (which seem to be somehow the maximally singular cases where orbifold Chern classes can be defined, as we explain below), it is possible to find a smooth cover of X—defined in codimension two—that makes D integral; then one can follow a construction similar to that of Mumford and define $c_2(X, D)$. With this definition at hand, we prove the Miyaoka-Yau inequality for minimal dlt pairs whose boundary has standard coefficients, as well as for minimal lc pairs with reduced boundary:

Theorem B. — **(The Miyaoka-Yau inequality for minimal lc pairs)**
Let X be a normal projective variety of dimension n and D an effective divisor verifying one of the following conditions.

(*i*) *The divisor D is reduced, (X, D) has log canonical singularities and X is klt.*

(*ii*) *The pair (X, D) is dlt with standard coefficients, i.e. $D = \sum(1-\frac{1}{n_i})\cdot D_i$, $n_i \in \mathbb{N}^+\cup\{\infty\}$.*

(*iii*) *The pair (X, D) is log-smooth, where $D = \sum d_i \cdot D_i$, $d_i \in [0, 1]\cap\mathbb{Q}$.*

Assuming that $(K_X + D)$ is nef, let ν denote the numerical Kodaira dimension *of $(K_X + D)$. Then, for an ample divisor H in X, the inequality*

$$\big(2(n+1)\cdot c_2(X, D) - n\cdot c_1^2(X, D)\big)\cdot(K_X + D)^i \cdot H^j \geqslant 0. \tag{1.3}$$

holds, where $i = n-2$, $j = 0$, when $\nu(K_X + D) \geqslant n-2$ and $i = \nu$, $j = n-\nu-2$ otherwise.

We follow the usual convention by setting "$n_i = \infty$" when the expression $(1 - \frac{1}{n_i})$ is equal to 1. Also recall that the numerical Kodaira dimension $\nu(B)$ of a nef $\mathbb{Q}$-divisor B is defined by $\nu(B) := \max\{m \in \mathbb{N} \mid B^m \not\equiv 0\}$. For the definition of the various singularities that appear in this paper we refer to [**KM98**]. We recall that klt singularities are dlt, and dlt singularities are lc.

A few remarks about Theorem B. — We would like to detail a few points about Theorem B.

· The restriction on the singularities is essential to guarantee the existence of suitable covers, and consequently a good notion for $c_2(X, D)$; we refer to Section 2.4 for an in-depth discussion.

· The strategy of the proof of Theorem B relies, in a crucial way, on an approximating process which amounts to replacing (X, D) by $(X, D + \frac{1}{m}H)$ for some suitable ample divisor H, and then passing to the limit when $m \to \infty$. This approximation, detailed in Proposition 2.14 is required:

• to clear the poles of the Higgs field in the last step of the proof: as the new pair is klt, the canonical Higgs field on the cover has no poles along the divisor (rather zeros), allowing us apply Simpson's results vis-à-vis the Kobayashi-Hitchin correspondence.

• to be able to deal with the case $K_X + D$ nef, not necessarily ample (or big).

The remark above highlights the importance of having a good (intrinsic) theory of orbifold sheaves (and related objects) in the case of boundary with *arbitrary rational coefficients*, which form the main bulk of the preliminary sections 2 and 3 of the current paper. These constructions provide sufficient flexibility that is crucial in dealing with the approximation process mentioned above. Indeed it is in this context that we establish slope semistability for the tangent sheaf of minimal models; a result that turns out to be an essential tool in proving Theorem B.

Theorem C. — **(Semistability of the orbifold tangent sheaf of minimal lc pairs).** *The orbifold tangent sheaf of any minimal log canonical pair of log general type (X, D) is slope semistable with respect to $K_X + D$.*

The general strategy to prove Theorem C is inspired from [**CP14**] and [**Gue16**], and the main analytical input is the theory of *conical/cuspidal* metrics, cf §4.1. These metrics are the logarithmic (or pair) analogue of Kähler metrics and they provide canonical -though possibly singular- hermitian metrics on the orbifold tangent sheaf of a pair (X, D), say when $K_X + D$ is ample. These metrics are the key to derive geometric properties of the orbifold tangent sheaf (like semistability) knowing only positivity/negativity properties of its determinant. However, when the pair (X, D) is singular, these metrics are unfortunately too singular to carry over the existing analysis in the (log) smooth case. So one needs to regularize the

metrics on a resolution and control the resulting error terms. This constitutes the core of the work to get Theorem C.

The last step of the proof of Theorem C is to relate the semistability of the orbifold tangent sheaf of a resolution to the one of X. This is a place where it is crucial to have defined the orbifold tangent sheaf in an intrinsic way (that is, not with any particular choice for a cover but rather the possibility to work with all adapted covers at the same time).

Application to the Abundance Conjecture. — The inequality (1.3) in dimension 2 was established, through purely algebraic methods, by Miyaoka in the smooth setting. In higher dimensions a weaker inequality was famously proved, again by Miyaoka, via his work on generic semipositivity of the cotangent sheaves of minimal models, an approach that heavily depends on sophisticated characteristic-p arguments. Miyaoka's result in dimension 3, and its generalization by Megyesi ([**K$^+$92**, Chapt. 10]), namely the inequality

$$c_2(X,D)\cdot(K_X+D)\geqslant 0$$

for a minimal lc pair (X,D) with klt X, was fundamental to the proof of Abundance conjecture for threefold cf. [**Kaw92**] and [**K$^+$92**]. In this light, Theorem B provides an alternative way for proving the Abundance Conjecture (in dimension 3), that is independent of generic positivity results for cotangent sheaves of minimal models.

Structure of the paper. —

• Sections 2 and 3 provide the suitable algebraic framework to work with sheaves on pairs (X,D), where D has rational coefficients. Roughly speaking, every lc pair (X,D), with X being klt, has a natural structure of a local Deligne-Mumford stack in codimension two (see Subsection 2.3). Such structures can then be endowed with linearized sheaves; the *orbifold sheaves*. In particular, and inspired by the works of Campana, we can naturally define an orbifold tangent sheaf for the pair (X,D) (Definition 2.17). The Chern classes of such orbifold sheaves can then be defined in an orbifold sense (see Section 2.6).

• In Section 4, after recalling the basic definitions about conical/cuspidal metrics, we then use the regularity results of [**GP16**] about conical/cuspidal Monge-Ampère equations to derive the semistability of the orbifold tangent sheaf of any minimal lc pair, in the spirit of [**Gue16**]. Even though the global approach is similar, one of the key estimates (Lemma 4.3) requires a new input, cf Remark 4.4.

• In Section 5, and by following a similar strategy to that of [**GKPT15**], we prove Theorem B using Theorem C to construct a a stable orbi-Higgs sheaf whose Bogomolov-Gieseker Chern class discriminant is equal to that of Miyaoka-Yau for the orbifold tangent sheaf of (X,D). At this point Simpson's result on the Kobayashi-Hitchin correspondence for Higgs bundles can be used to prove the Miyaoka-Yau inequality for (X,D).

Previously known results. — As we explained above already, the Miyaoka-Yau inequality and its various generalization have been intensely studied. There are been different types of generalization so far:

· By relaxing the assumption on ampleness of K_X and replacing it with K_X nef and big. The first approach seems to be due to Tsuji [Tsu88] using orbifold metrics; later, Zhang [Zha09a] gave a proof using the Kähler-Ricci flow relying on the scalar curvature bound of Z. Zhang [Zha09b]. Finally, Song and Wang [SW16] used the regularity results of [JMR16] about conical metrics to reprove that inequality. The idea that conical metrics could be used to generalize Miyaoka-Yau inequality has been suggested by Tian [Tia94] already twenty years ago.

· In the setting of log smooth pairs (X, D) with standard coefficients, the Miyaoka-Yau inequality has been obtained by R. Kobayashi [Kob84] (assuming D reduced) and Tian-Yau [TY87] (in general). The proofs rely on the generalization of Aubin-Yau theorem in this setting, where the suitable geometry involves orbifold and cuspidal metrics. Song-Wang [SW16] (partially) generalized this results to the case where (X, D) is log smooth and D has arbitrary real coefficients (in $(0, 1)$), using conical Kähler-Einstein metrics.

· For singular klt surfaces, and more generally for log canonical pairs (S, C) where S is a klt surface and C is a (reduced) curve such that $K_S + C$ is nef, the Miyaoka-Yau inequality was showed by Megyesi [K$^+$92, Chap. 10].

· In another direction, Simpson [Sim92] observed that Miyaoka-Yau inequality can be (almost formally) deduced from Bogomolov-Gieseker inequality for semistable bundles using the Higgs bundle $\Omega_X \oplus \mathcal{O}_X$.

· Using Simpson's much more robust approach and the first author's semistability result [Gue16], Greb, Kebekus, Peternell and the second author have recently proved the Miyaoka-Yau inequality for projective varieties of general type with klt singularities, cf. [GKPT15].

Acknowledgements. — Both authors would like to thank Daniel Greb, Stefan Kebekus, Robert Lazarsfeld, Mihai Păun, Thomas Peternell and Jason Starr for helpful discussions.

2. Preliminaries on orbifolds sheaves, Chern classes and stability

***Definition 2.1* (Pairs).** — A pair (X, D) consists of a normal quasi-projective variety X and a divisor $D = \sum d_i \cdot D_i$, where $d_i = (1 - \frac{b_i}{a_i}) \in [0, 1] \cap \mathbb{Q}$ and a_i, $b_i \in \mathbb{Z}^+$. We say that (X, D) has standard coefficients, if $b_i = 1$, for every i. In the following, a_i and b_i are always assumed to be relatively prime.

***Definition 2.2* (Pull-back of Weil divisors).** — Let $f : Y \to X$ be a finite, flat and surjective morphism between normal quasi-projective varieties Y and X. For every Weil divisor $D \subset X$, we define the pull-back $f^*(D)$ by the Zariski-closure of $f^*(D|_{X_{\mathrm{reg}}})$.

2.1. Adapted morphisms. —

***Definition 2.3* (Adapted morphisms).** — Let (X, D) be an orbifold pair as in Definition 2.1. A finite, Galois, flat and surjective morphism $f : Y \to (X, D)$ is called adapted (to (X, D)) if

1. The variety Y is a normal and quasi-projective.
2. For every i, there exists $m_i \in \mathbb{N}^+$ and a Weil divisor $D'_i \subset Y$ such that $f^*(D_i) = (m_i a_i) \cdot D'_i$.
3. The morphism f is étale at the generic point of $\mathrm{Supp}(\lfloor D \rfloor)$.

Furthermore, we say that f is *strictly adapted* if $m_i = 1$, for all i.

***Definition 2.4* (Orbifold-étale morphisms).** — Given a pair (X, D), we call a strictly adapted morphism $f : Y \to (X, D)$ orbifold-étale, if the branch locus of f in codimension one only consists of $\mathrm{Supp}(D)$.

2.2. Orbifold structures. —

***Definition 2.5* (Local orbifold structures).** — We say that a pair (X, D) has an orbifold structure at $x \in X$, if there is a Zariski open neighbourhood $U_x \subseteq X$ of x equipped with a morphism $f_x : V_x \to U_x$ adapted to $(X, D)|_{U_x}$. Furthermore, if U_x is smooth and $\mathrm{Supp}(f_x^*(D))$ is simple normal crossing, we say that that the orbi-structure defined by (U_x, f_x, V_x) is smooth.

***Definition 2.6* (Strict and étale orbifold structures).** — In Definition 2.4, if f_x is strictly adapted or orbi-étale, we say that the orbi-structure at x is, respectively, strict or étale. In the orbi-étale case, the data (U_x, f_x, V_x) defines a (local) Deligne-Mumford stack with coarse moduli space $f_x : V_x \to U_x$ whose isotropic groups at the generic point of X_x are trivial and cyclic of order a_i along the reduced components of $f_x^*(D_i)$.

***Definition 2.7* (Global structures).** — Let $\mathcal{C} = \{(U_\alpha, f_\alpha, X_\alpha)\}_{\alpha \in I}$, where I is an index set, be a collection ordered triples describing local orbi-structures on X. Let $\alpha, \beta \in I$ and define $X_{\alpha\beta}$ be the normalization of the fibre product $(X_\alpha \times_{(U_\alpha \cap U_\beta)} X_\beta)$ with the associated commutative diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X_{\alpha\beta} & \xrightarrow{g_{\beta\alpha}} & X_\beta \\ {\scriptstyle g_{\alpha\beta}}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle f_\beta} \\ X_\alpha & \xrightarrow{f_\alpha} & U_\alpha \cap U_\beta, \end{array}$$

where $g_{\alpha\beta} : X_{\alpha\beta} \to X_\alpha$ and $g_{\beta\alpha} : X_{\alpha\beta} \to X_\beta$ are the projection maps. We say that $\mathcal{C}$ defines an orbi-structure on X, if $\bigcup_{\alpha \in I} U_\alpha = X$ and, for each $\alpha, \beta \in I$, the two morphisms $g_{\alpha\beta}$ and $g_{\beta\alpha}$ are étale.

2.2.1. *Examples.* — We now give a list of examples that are relevant to the rest of our discussions in the current article.

***Example 2.8* (Orbi-structures for snc pairs).** — Every pair (X, D) with X smooth and D having a simple normal crossing support admits various orbi-structures. Indeed, for every $x \in X$ there exists a Zariski open subset $U_x \subset X$ that can be endowed with a canonical smooth, étale orbi-structure as follows. Let U_x be a Zariski neighbourhood of x where each irreducible component $\{(D_i|_{U_x})\}_{i=1}^k$ of D is principal, given by the zero of $f_i \in \mathcal{O}_{U_x}$. Let $\{t_i\}_{i=1}^k$ parametrize each copy of $\mathbb{C}$ in the cartesian product $\mathbb{C}^k \times U_x$. Then, the subvariety $V_x \subset \mathbb{C}^k \times U_x$ defined by the zero of $\{(t_i^{a_i} - f_i)\}_{i=1}^k$ admits a projection onto U_x that is orbi-étale with respect to $(X, D)|_{U_x}$. The existence of the smooth orbi-structure now follows from repeating this construction for each $x \in X$. Such pairs also admit a global, but non-canonical structure. More precisely, thanks to Kawamata's construction, cf.[**Laz04a**, Prop. 4.1.12], every snc pair (X, D) admits a strict, smooth orbi-structure $f : Y \to X$, which fails to be orbi-étale along a non-unique, very ample divisor.

***Example 2.9* (The normal $\mathbb{Q}$-factorial case).** — If we assume that X is $\mathbb{Q}$-factorial, then for every $\mathbb{Q}$-effective such that (X, D) is a pair, and for every $x \in X$ there is a quasi-projective neighbourhood U_α together with a normal, quasi-projective variety V_α equipped with a surjective, orbi-étale morphism $f_\alpha : V_\alpha \to (U_\alpha, D)$. Here the $\mathbb{Q}$-factoriality assumption allows us to mimic the construction in the simple normal crossing case. The collection $\{(U_\alpha, f_\alpha, V_\alpha)\}$ then forms an étale, orbi-structure for (X, D). As for global structures, Kawamata's construction also allows us to endow X with a global strict, but not necessarily étale, orbi-structure defined by a single strictly adapted morphism $f : Y \to (X, D)$.

2.3. Orbi-structures for log-canonical spaces. — In this section, we construct smooth, orbi-étale structures in codimension two for pairs satisfying the assumptions of Theorem B. Later, this will make it possible to define a meaningful second Chern class for these pairs. More precisely, one needs smoothness to define Chern classes, and étalité to make sure that these classes are independent of choices, cf Section 3.2 for more details.

But first, let us recall the following result, which is a consequence of the classification of klt singularities pairs in dimension two, see [**GKKP11**, Prop. 9.3] for a complete explanation.

***Proposition 2.10.* — (Klt spaces have quotient singularities in codimension two).** *Let X be a quasi-projective variety with klt singularities. Then, there exists a Zariski open subset $X^\circ \subseteq X$, with $\operatorname{codim}(X \backslash X^\circ) \geqslant 3$, such that X° has quotient singularities. More precisely, given any $x \in X^\circ$ there exists a quasi-projective neighborhood $V_\alpha^\circ \subseteq X^\circ$ of x and a smooth quasi-projective variety W_α° together with a finite, surjective and Galois morphism $h_\alpha^\circ : W_\alpha^\circ \to V_\alpha^\circ$ which is étale outside the singular set.*

As explained above, the existence of local smooth covers on klt spaces allow to construct orbi-structures with nice properties:

Corollary 2.11. — *Let (X, D) be a pair satisfying of of the following conditions:*

1. *X is klt, D is reduced and (X, D) is lc.*
2. *(X, D) is a dlt pair with standard coefficients.*

Then, there exists a natural choice of a smooth, orbi-étale structure in codimension two.

Proof. — Assume we are in the first case. By Proposition 2.10, one can cover a open subset $X^\circ \subseteq X$ of codimension at least three by the image of quasi-étale Galois finite maps defined on a smooth variety. By definition, these maps form a smooth, orbi-étale structure of X°.

Assume now that we are in the second case. As X is $\mathbb{Q}$-factorial in codimension two, there is a Zariski open subset $X^\circ \subseteq X$, with $\operatorname{codim}(X \backslash X^\circ) \geqslant 3$, that can be equipped with a covering U_α° and orbi-étale morphisms $f_\alpha^\circ : V_\alpha^\circ \to U_\alpha^\circ$ with respect to $D - \lfloor D \rfloor$ (see Example 2.9). Here, the ramification formula reads

$$K_{V_\alpha^\circ} \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} (f_\alpha^\circ)^*(K_{U_\alpha^\circ} + (D - \lfloor D \rfloor)).$$

It thus follows from [**KM98**, Prop. 5.20] that V_α° is klt. From Proposition 2.10 above we know that, in codimension two, each V_α° has a local, quasi-étale covering $\{h_\alpha^\circ : W_{\alpha\beta}^\circ \to V_\alpha^\circ\}$ by smooth quasi-projective varieties $W_{\alpha\beta}^\circ$. The smooth orbi-étale structure now follows from the composition of these maps.

□

2.4. Two examples of singularities without smooth orbi-structures. — The very elementary examples below show how the restrictions on the singularities in Theorem B cannot be removed if one wants to find a smooth cover (in codimension two) that is adapted to the boundary divisor.

The first example below shows that if the pair (X, D) is not dlt but merely log canonical, there is no hope in finding a smooth cover in codimension two, even if the coefficients are standard.

Example 2.12. — Set $X := \mathbb{C}^2$, and let $C = \{y^2 + x^3 = 0\} \subset \mathbb{C}^2$ be the cusp. Then it is well known that $\operatorname{lct}(X, C) = \frac{5}{6}$, which means that $(X, \frac{5}{6}C)$ is lc but not klt. Denote by $Y := \{t^6 = y^2 + x^3\} \subset \mathbb{C}^3$ the standard cover and set $C' := \{t = 0\}$. The ramification formula can be written the following two ways

$$K_Y \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} p^*(K_X + \frac{5}{6}C) \quad \text{or} \quad K_Y + C' \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} p^*(K_X + C)$$

which show respectively that Y is indeed lc but not klt and that (Y, C') is not lc. Moreover, the singularity $(Y, 0)$, called simple elliptic, is not a quotient singularity, cf [**Kol97**, Thm. 3.6] (this is also a consequence of the fact that quotient singularities are $\mathbb{Q}$-factorial [**KM98**, Lem. 5.16] hence klt, as the covering map would be quasi-étale and thus crepant).

The next example, in the similar vein as above, shows that if one does not require D to have standard coefficients, then the ramified covers will in general *not* be klt; an obstruction to much of the theory that will be developed in Subsection 2.6, cf also Proposition 2.10.

Example 2.13. — Let (X, D) be a pair with X smooth, D irreducible and reduced such that $\mathrm{lct}(X, D) < 1$. Then for m large enough, $(X, \frac{1}{m}D)$ is klt; however, any cover $p : Y \to X$ ramified at order m along D will satisfy

$$K_Y \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} p^*(K_X + \frac{m-1}{m}D)$$

but for m large enough, the pair $(X, \frac{m-1}{m}D)$ is not klt (or lc) anymore so that Y has worse singularities than lc. Therefore Y cannot be (locally) covered by a smooth variety, which as we will see in Subsection 2.6 poses a major difficulty for defining orbifold Chern classes.

2.5. The approximation process. — The following proposition in crucial in our approach, as it enables us to reduce the klt case (so further down the line, this translates into being able to apply the standard Simpson correspondence rather than a logarithmic version) and to deal with the general minimal case (rather than minimal and general type). The price to pay is working with arbitrary rational coefficients and not standard ones anymore.

Proposition 2.14. — *Given a pair (X, D) that is either lc with reduced boundary D or is dlt, there exists an ample divisor H such that, for all integers $m \geqslant 2$, the new pair $(X, D_m) := (X, D + \frac{1}{m} \cdot H)$ is a klt pair admitting a smooth, orbi-étale structure in codimension two.*

Proof. — Let A be an irreducible very ample divisor that is not contained in $\mathrm{Supp}(D)$. Define $H := (A - \lfloor D \rfloor)$. Now, the divisor $(D + (1/m) \cdot H)$ can be decomposed as

$$D_m := \underbrace{(D - \lfloor D \rfloor)}_{D^{\mathrm{orb}}} + (1 - \frac{1}{m}) \cdot \lfloor D \rfloor + \underbrace{(1 - \frac{b}{a})}_{:= (1/m)} \cdot A.$$

As X is $\mathbb{Q}$-factorial for every $x \in X$ there exists a Zariski open neighbourhood U_α that can be equipped with strictly adapted morphism $r_\alpha : V_\alpha \to (U_\alpha, D_m)$, where V_α is a normal quasi-projective variety. (See Example 2.9).

Claim 1. — *The variety V_α is klt.*

Proof of Claim 1. From the ramification formula we have

$$K_{V_\alpha} \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} r_\alpha^*\big(K_{U_\alpha} + D^{\mathrm{orb}} + (1 - \frac{1}{m}) \cdot \lfloor D \rfloor + (1 - 1/a) \cdot A\big).$$

The claim will follow from [**KM98**, Prop. 5.20] if one can prove that $\big(U_\alpha, D^{\mathrm{orb}} + (1 - \frac{1}{m}) \cdot \lfloor D \rfloor + (1 - 1/a) \cdot A\big)$ is klt. First, notice that X is $\mathbb{Q}$-factorial, so all the (adjoint) divisors involved are $\mathbb{Q}$-Cartier. Next, as (X, D^{orb}) is klt, the pair $(X, D^{\mathrm{orb}} + (1 - \frac{1}{m}) \cdot \lfloor D \rfloor)$ is klt for any $m \geqslant 1$. Indeed, the discrepancies of that new pair are a strictly convex combination of the discrepancies of (X, D^{orb}) and (X, D). If $\pi : \widetilde{X} \to X$ is a log resolution of (X, D) whose exceptional locus has pure codimension one, then $|\pi^* A|$ is a free linear system on $\widetilde{X}$. By Bertini theorem, one can choose a sufficiently general member of that system that contains no components of the exceptional divisor, and that intersects the exceptional locus transversely, cf [**Laz04b**, 9.1.9 & 9.2.29]. As a consequence, $(X, D^{\mathrm{orb}} + (1 - \frac{1}{m}) \cdot \lfloor D \rfloor + cA)$

is klt for any $0 \leqslant c < 1$ if A is general. This concludes the proof of the claim. □

Now, as V_α is klt, there is a Zariski open subset $V_\alpha^\circ \subseteq V_\alpha$ of $\mathrm{codim}_{V_\alpha}(V_\alpha \backslash V_\alpha^\circ)$ covered by finite number of Zariski open subsets $V_{\alpha\beta}^\circ$ and finite, surjective, Galois morphism $h_{\alpha\beta}^\circ : W_{\alpha\beta}^\circ \to V_{\alpha\beta}^\circ$, where $W_{\alpha\beta}^\circ$ is smooth and $h_{\alpha\beta}^\circ$ is only ramified along $\mathrm{sing}(V_{\alpha\beta}^\circ)$. Set $U_{\alpha\beta}^\circ := \mathrm{Im}\,(r|_{V_{\alpha\beta}^\circ})$ and $g_{\alpha\beta}^\circ := h_{\alpha\beta}^\circ \circ r_\alpha$.



The collection $\{(U_{\alpha\beta}^\circ, g_{\alpha\beta}^\circ, W_{\alpha\beta}^\circ)\}$ now defines a smooth, orbi-étale structure for the pair (X, D_m) in codimension two.

□

2.6. Orbi-sheaves and Chern classes. —

***Definition 2.15* (Orbi-sheaves).** — Let $\mathcal{C} = \{(U_\alpha, f_\alpha, X_\alpha)\}_{\alpha\in I}$ be an orbi-structure on a given quasi-projective variety X. As in Definition 2.7, let $X_{\alpha\beta}$ be the normalization of the fibre product $X_\alpha \times_{U_\alpha\cap U_\beta} X_\beta$ with naturally induced morphisms $g_\alpha : X_{\alpha\beta} \to X_\alpha$ and $g_\beta : X_{\alpha\beta} \to X_\beta$. Set $G_\alpha := \mathrm{Gal}(X_\alpha/U_\alpha)$. We call a collection $\{\mathscr{F}_\alpha\}_\alpha$ of coherent G_α-sheaves of rank r on each X_α an orbi-sheaf on (X, D) of rank r with respect $\mathcal{C}$, if $g_\alpha^*(\mathscr{F}_\alpha) \cong g_\beta^*(\mathscr{F}_\beta)$. We denote this collection by $\mathscr{F}_\mathcal{C}$. We say that $\mathscr{F}_\mathcal{C}$ is torsion free, reflexive or locally free orbi-sheaf, if each $\mathscr{F}_\alpha$ is torsion free, reflexive or locally free, respectively.

***Definition 2.16* (Orbi-subsheaves).** — Let (X, D) be a pair with an orbi-structure $\mathcal{C} = \{(U_\alpha, f_\alpha, X_\alpha)\}_{\alpha\in I}$. Let $\mathscr{E}_\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathscr{F}_\mathcal{C}$ be two orbi-sheaves with respect to $\mathcal{C}$. We say that $\mathscr{F}_\mathcal{C}$ is an orbi-subsheaf of $\mathscr{E}_\mathcal{C}$, if, for each α, we have the inclusion $\mathscr{F}_\alpha \subseteq \mathscr{E}_\alpha$.

2.6.1. *Higgs sheaves in the orbifold category.* —

Notation 1. — *Let $f_\alpha : Y \to X$ be a a morphism adapted to D, where $D = \sum d_i \cdot D_i$, $d_i = (1 - \frac{b_i}{a_i}) \in (0, 1] \cap \mathbb{Q}$. For every prime component D_i of $D - \lfloor D \rfloor$, let $\{D^{ij}\}_{j(i)}$ be the collection of prime divisors that appear in $f^{-1}(D_i)$. We define new divisors in Y by*

$$D_Y^{ij} := b_i \cdot D^{ij} \tag{2.1}$$

$$D_f := f^*(\lfloor D \rfloor) \tag{2.2}$$

***Definition 2.17* (Orbifold (co)tangent sheaf).** — Let (X, D) be a pair with a given orbifold structure $\mathcal{C} = \{(U_\alpha, f_\alpha, X_\alpha)\}_{\alpha\in I}$. Let $G_\alpha := \mathrm{Gal}(X_\alpha/U_\alpha)$. For every $\alpha \in I$, define D_{ij}^α, $D_{X_\alpha}^{ij}$ and D_{f_α} to be the divisors defined in Notation 1. Denote X_α° to be the smooth locus of the pair $(X_\alpha, \sum D_{ij} + D_f)$ and set $D_{X_\alpha^\circ}^{ij} := D_{X_\alpha}^{ij}|_{X_\alpha^\circ}$, $D_{f_\alpha}^\circ := D_{f_\alpha}|_{X_\alpha^\circ}$. Define $\Omega^1_{(X_\alpha^\circ, f_\alpha, D)}$ to be the kernel of the sheaf morphism

$$((f_\alpha)|_{X_\alpha^\circ})^*\big(\Omega^1_X(\log(\ulcorner D \urcorner))\big) \longrightarrow \bigoplus_{i,j(i)} \mathcal{O}_{D^{ij}_{X_\alpha^\circ}}$$

induced by the natural residue map. Set $\Omega^{[1]}_{(X_\alpha,f_\alpha,D)}$ to be the trivial coherent extension $(i_{X_\alpha^\circ})_*(\Omega^1_{(X_\alpha^\circ,f_\alpha,D)})$, where $i_{X_\alpha^\circ}$ is the natural inclusion map. We define the orbi-cotangent sheaf $\Omega^{[1]}_{(\mathcal{C},D)}$ of (X,D) with respect to $\mathcal{C}$ to be the orbi-sheaf given by the collection of reflexive, G_α-sheaves $\{\Omega^{[1]}_{(X_\alpha,f_\alpha,D)}\}_{\alpha\in I}$. We define the orbifold tangent sheaf $\mathscr{T}_{(\mathcal{C},D)}$ by the collection $\{\mathscr{T}_{(X_\alpha,f_\alpha,D)}\}$, where $\mathscr{T}_{(X_\alpha,f_\alpha,D)} := (\Omega^{[1]}_{(X_\alpha,f_\alpha,D)})^*$.
We refer to [**CKT16**, §3] for a more concrete description of the orbi-cotangent sheaf in terms of differential forms with zeros and poles.

Definition 2.18 **(Orbi-Higgs sheaves).** — Let (X,D) be a pair equipped with an orbi-structure $\mathcal{C}$. We call an orbi-sheaf $\mathscr{F}_\mathcal{C}$ an orbi-Higgs sheaf, if there is an orbi-sheaf morphism $\theta_\mathcal{C} : \mathscr{F}_\mathcal{C} \to \mathscr{F}_\mathcal{C} \otimes \Omega^{[1]}_{(\mathcal{C},D)}$ satisfying the integrability condition $\theta_\mathcal{C} \wedge \theta_\mathcal{C} = 0$. An orbi-Higgs subsheaf is then defined to be an orbi-subsheaf that is invariant under $\theta_\mathcal{C}$.

2.6.2. *Global covers associated to orbi-structures.* — In this section, we recall a construction due to Mumford [**Mum83**, §2] enabling to define Chern classes for varieties with quotient singularities. We refer to [**GKPT15**, §3.7] for more details about it. Let us note that in our case, the local covers will not be quasi-étale but this won't affect the construction.

Let (X,D) be a pair with a *smooth* orbi-structure $\mathcal{C} = \{(U_\alpha, f_\alpha, X_\alpha)\}_{\alpha\in I}$. We consider a finite, Galois field extension of the function field $\mathbb{C}(X)$ containing all the function fields $\mathbb{C}(X_\alpha)$. Let $\widehat{X}$ be the normalization of X in this field extension so that $X = \widehat{X}/G$ with Galois group G. Let $\gamma : \widehat{X} \to X$ be the induced finite Galois morphism factoring through each f_α:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \widehat{X}_\mathcal{C} & & \xrightarrow{\quad\gamma\quad} & & X \\ \uparrow & & & & \uparrow \\ \widehat{X}_\alpha & \xrightarrow{q_\alpha} & X_\alpha & \xrightarrow{f_\alpha} & U_\alpha \end{array}$$

where we have set $\widehat{X}_\alpha := \gamma^{-1}(U_\alpha)$ and $q_\alpha := \gamma|_{\widehat{X}_\alpha}$. We sometimes refer to γ as the *Mumford cover* associated to $\mathcal{C} = \{(U_\alpha, f_\alpha, X_\alpha)\}_{\alpha\in I}$. Furthermore, given any orbi-sheaf $\mathscr{F}_\mathcal{C}$ we can define a G-sheaf $\widehat{\mathscr{F}_\mathcal{C}}$ on $\widehat{X}_\mathcal{C}$ associated to $\mathcal{C}$ by

$$\widehat{\mathscr{F}_\mathcal{C}}|_{\widehat{X}_\alpha} = q_\alpha^*(\mathscr{F}_\alpha).$$

2.6.3. *Orbi-Chern classes.* — Let (X,D) be a pair such that X°, the maximal Zariski open subset of X over which (X,D) admits a smooth orbi-structure $\mathcal{C} = \{(U^\circ_\alpha, f_\alpha, V^\circ_\alpha)\}$, satisfies $\mathrm{codim}_X(X\backslash X^\circ) \geqslant 3$.

Let $\gamma : \widehat{X}^\circ_\mathcal{C} \to X^\circ$ be the Mumford cover, defined in Subsection 2.6.2, associated to the orbi-structure $\mathcal{C}$. Let $G := \mathrm{Gal}(\widehat{X}^\circ_\mathcal{C}/X^\circ)$. Following the notations introduced in Subsection 2.6.2, let $\{\mathscr{F}_\alpha\}^\mathcal{C}_\alpha$ be a torsion free orbi-sheaf and $\widehat{\mathscr{F}_\mathcal{C}}$ the associated G-sheaf on $\widehat{X}^\circ$

defined by the equality $\widehat{\mathscr{F}_{\mathcal{C}}}|_{V_\alpha^\circ} = q_\alpha^*(\mathscr{F}_\alpha)$. By [Mum83, Thm. 3.1], there is an isomorphism

$$\mathrm{A}_{n-i}(X^\circ)\otimes\mathbb{Q} \cong \left(\mathrm{A}^i(\widehat{X}_{\mathcal{C}}^\circ)\right)^G\otimes\mathbb{Q}, \tag{2.3}$$

where $\left(\mathrm{A}^i(\widehat{X}_{\mathcal{C}}^\circ)\right)^G$ denoted the classes of G-invariant ith cocycles. As a consequence $\left(\mathrm{A}^i(\widehat{X}_{\mathcal{C}}^\circ)\right)^G$ inherits a ring structure. Because $\widehat{X}_{\mathcal{C}}^\circ$ is normal, it is Cohen-Macaulay in codimension 2, so up to shrinking X° one can assume that $\widehat{X}_{\mathcal{C}}^\circ$ is Cohen-Macaulay. Combined with the smoothness of X_α, this implies that the finite morphism q_α is flat and therefore that the finite resolution of each $\mathscr{F}_\alpha$ by locally free sheaves lifts, and thanks to Mumford ([Mum83, Prop. 2.1]), the G-sheaf $\widehat{\mathscr{F}_{\mathcal{C}}}$ on $\widehat{X}_{\mathcal{C}}^\circ$ has a finite, locally free resolution; in particular we can define its Chern classes:

$$c_i(\mathscr{F}_{\mathcal{C}}) := c_i(\widehat{\mathscr{F}_{\mathcal{C}}}) \in \left(\mathrm{A}^i(\widehat{X}_{\mathcal{C}}^\circ)\right)^G.$$

On the other hand, from the localization sequence of Chow groups, we have $A_{n-i}(X^\circ) \cong A_{n-i}(X)$, whenever $\mathrm{codim}_X(X\backslash X^\circ) > i$. As a result when X is projective, and by using the isomorphism (2.3), the classes $c_1(\mathscr{F}_{\mathcal{C}})$, $c_1^2(\mathscr{F}_{\mathcal{C}})$ and $c_2(\mathscr{F}_{\mathcal{C}})$ are all well-defined as multilinear forms on $\mathrm{N}^1(X)_{\mathbb{Q}}^{n-1}$and $\mathrm{N}^1(X)_{\mathbb{Q}}^{n-2}$, respectively.

2.6.4. *Slope and stability.* — In this last short paragraph, one defines the notion of stability for orbi-sheaves.

Definition 2.19 **(Slope of orbi-sheaves).** — Let X be a normal projective variety and D a $\mathbb{Q}$-effective divisor with an orbi-structure $\mathcal{C}$ in codimension one. Given an orbi-sheaf $\mathscr{F}_{\mathcal{C}}$ we define its slope $\mu_P(\mathscr{F}_{\mathcal{C}})$ with respect to a nef divisor P on X by

$$\mu_P(\mathscr{F}_{\mathcal{C}}) = \frac{1}{\mathrm{rank}(\mathscr{F}_{\mathcal{C}})}\, c_1(\mathscr{F}_{\mathcal{C}})\cdot[P]^{n-1}.$$

Definition 2.20 **(Stability of orbi-sheaves).** — In the setting of Definition 2.19 assume that the nef divisor P verifies $P^{n-1}\not\equiv 0$. We say that a torsion free orbi-sheaf $\mathscr{E}_{\mathcal{C}}$ is semistable with respect to P, if for every non-zero, torsion free orbi-subsheaf $\mathscr{F}_{\mathcal{C}}\subset\mathscr{E}_{\mathcal{C}}$ we have

$$\mu_P(\mathscr{F}_{\mathcal{C}}) \leqslant \mu_P(\mathscr{E}_{\mathcal{C}}), \tag{2.4}$$

In case of stability we require the inequality in (2.4) to be strict for any such subsheaf $\mathscr{F}_{\mathcal{C}}$ with $\mathrm{rank}(\mathscr{F}_{\mathcal{C}}) < \mathrm{rank}(\mathscr{E}_{\mathcal{C}})$.

3. Behaviour of Chern classes and stability under change of orbi-structures

3.1. Invariance of semistability. — In this paragraph, we investigate how Chern classes may change when the orbifold structure change. Provided that change of structure is compatible in a sense to be defined, we show that these numbers don't change, and neither does the semistability property for orbi-sheaves.

Definition 3.1 **(Compatible orbi-sheaves).** — Let (X, D) be a pair equipped with two orbi-structures $\mathcal{C}_1 = \{(U_\alpha, f_\alpha, X_\alpha)\}_{\alpha\in I}$ and $\mathcal{C}_2 = \{(U_\beta, g_\beta, Y_\beta)\}_{\beta\in J}$. Let $U_{\alpha\beta} := U_\alpha\cap U_\beta$ and

$Z_{\alpha\beta}$ be the normalization of the fibre product $X_\alpha \times_{U_{\alpha\beta}} Y_\beta$ with the resulting commutative diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} Z_{\alpha\beta} & \xrightarrow{g_{\alpha\beta}} & Y_\beta \\ {\scriptstyle f_{\alpha\beta}}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle g_\beta} \\ X_\alpha & \xrightarrow{f_\alpha} & U_{\alpha\beta}. \end{array}$$

We say that two reflexive orbi-sheaves $\mathscr{F}_{\mathcal{C}_1}$ and $\mathscr{G}_{\mathcal{C}_2}$ are compatible, if for each α and β, the sheaf isomorphism $(f_{\alpha\beta})^{[*]}(\mathscr{F}_\alpha) \cong (g_{\alpha\beta})^{[*]}(\mathscr{G}_\beta)$ holds, as $G_{\alpha\beta}$-sheaves, where $G_{\alpha\beta} := \mathrm{Gal}(Z_{\alpha\beta}/U_{\alpha\beta})$ – remember that being Galois is stable under flat base change.

Example 3.2. — **(Compatibility of orbi-cotangent sheaves)** Let $\mathcal{C}_1$ and $\mathcal{C}_2$ be two strict orbi-structures for a pair (X, D). Then the orbi-cotangent sheaves $\Omega^{[1]}_{(\mathcal{C}_1,D)}$ and $\Omega^{[1]}_{(\mathcal{C}_2,D)}$ are compatible.

In the next proposition, we show that as long as there exists one orbi-étale structure for a pair (X, D), then the Chern classes are well-defined.

Proposition 3.3. — **(Invariance of Chern classes for compatible orbi-sheaves)** *Let X be a normal projective variety and D a $\mathbb{Q}$-effective divisor such that (X, D) has a set of smooth and strict orbi-structures $J = \{\mathcal{C}_i\}$ in codimension $k \geqslant 1$. Let $\{\mathscr{F}_{\mathcal{C}_i}\}$ be a collection of compatible locally free (or reflexive) sheaves. If J admits an étale orbi-structure in codimension $k = 1$ (resp. $k = 2$), then the classes c_1, c_1^2 (resp. c_2) of $\mathscr{F}_{\mathcal{C}_i}$, as multilinear forms on $\mathrm{N}^1(X)^{n-1}_{\mathbb{Q}}$ (resp. $\mathrm{N}^1(X)^{n-2}_{\mathbb{Q}}$), are all equal.*

Proof. — Let $\mathcal{C}_1, \mathcal{C}_2 \in J$. Assume that $\mathcal{C}_2$ is étale. It suffices to show that the desired Chern classes for $\mathscr{F}_{\mathcal{C}_1} = \{\mathscr{F}^1_\alpha\}_\alpha$ and $\mathscr{F}_{\mathcal{C}_2} = \{\mathscr{F}^2_\beta\}_\beta$ coincide. Let X° be the maximal open subset of X over which $\mathcal{C}_1 = \{(U^\circ_\alpha, f^\circ_\alpha, X^\circ_\alpha)\}$ and $\mathcal{C}_2 = \{(U^\circ_\beta, g^\circ_\beta, Y^\circ_\beta)\}$ are defined. Let $U^\circ_{\alpha\beta} := U^\circ_\alpha \cap U^\circ_\beta$ and $Z^\circ_{\alpha\beta}$ be the normalization of the fibre product $X^\circ_\alpha \times_{U^\circ_{\alpha\beta}} Y^\circ_\beta$ with the induced projections $g_{\alpha\beta} : Z^\circ_{\alpha\beta} \to Y^\circ_\beta$ and $f_{\alpha\beta} : Z^\circ_{\alpha\beta} \to X^\circ_\alpha$. Let $\widehat{X}^\circ_{\mathcal{C}_1}$ and $\widehat{Y}^\circ_{\mathcal{C}_2}$ be the global Mumford covers associated to $\mathcal{C}_1$ and $\mathcal{C}_2$, respectively (see the construction in Subsection 2.6.2) and set $G_1 := \mathrm{Gal}(\widehat{X}^\circ_{\mathcal{C}_1}/X^\circ)$ and $G_2 := \mathrm{Gal}(\widehat{Y}^\circ_{\mathcal{C}_2}/X^\circ)$. Let $\widehat{Z}^\circ$ be the normalization of X in a Galois field extension of $\mathbb{C}(X^\circ)$ containing all the function field extensions $\mathbb{C}(Z^\circ_{\alpha\beta})$ resulting in the commutative diagram:



Notice that by construction, $f_{\alpha\beta}$ is étale in codimension one. As X°_α is smooth, the purity of branch locus implies that $f_{\alpha\beta}$ is étale and thus $Z_{\alpha\beta}$ is smooth. As a result $\mathcal{C}_{1,2} = \{(U^\circ_{\alpha\beta}, h_{\alpha\beta}, Z^\circ_{\alpha\beta})\}$ forms a smooth, orbi-structure.

The isomorphism $(f_{\alpha\beta})^*\mathscr{F}^1_\alpha \cong (g_{\alpha\beta})^*\mathscr{F}^2_\beta$ then implies that the two locally-free sheaves $\widetilde{f}^*(\widehat{\mathscr{F}_{\mathcal{C}_1}})$ and $\widetilde{g}^*(\widehat{\mathscr{F}_{\mathcal{C}_2}})$ are isomorphic on $\widehat{Z}^\circ$ as $G_{\widehat{Z}^\circ}$-sheaves, where $G_{\widehat{Z}^\circ} := \mathrm{Gal}(\widehat{Z}^\circ/X^\circ)$. In particular we have

$$c_2(\widetilde{f}^*\widehat{\mathscr{F}_{\mathcal{C}_1}}) = c_2(\widetilde{g}^*\widehat{\mathscr{F}_{\mathcal{C}_2}}) \in \left(A^2(\widehat{Z}^\circ)\right)^{G_{\widehat{z}^\circ}},$$

and similarly for c_1^2 and c_1. The proposition now follows from the isomorphism $A_{n-i}(X^\circ)\otimes\mathbb{Q} \cong A^i(\widehat{Z}^\circ)^{G_{\widehat{z}^\circ}}\otimes\mathbb{Q}$ and the commutative diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A^i(\widehat{Z}^\circ)^{G_{\widehat{z}^\circ}}\otimes\mathbb{Q} & \longrightarrow & A^i(\widehat{Y}^\circ_{\mathcal{C}_2})^{G_2}\otimes\mathbb{Q} \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ A^i(\widehat{X}^\circ_{\mathcal{C}_1})^{G_1}\otimes\mathbb{Q} & \longrightarrow & A_{n-i}(X^\circ)\otimes\mathbb{Q}. \end{array}$$

□

Proposition 3.4. — **(Independence of semistability for compatible orbi-sheaves).**
In the situation of Proposition 3.3, the orbi-sheaf $\mathscr{F}_{\mathcal{C}_1}$ is semistable with respect to a nef divisor $P \subset X$, if and only if the orbi-sheaf $\mathscr{G}_{\mathcal{C}_2}$ is semistable with respect to P.

Proof. — Let $\mathcal{C}_1$, $\mathcal{C}_2$ and $\mathcal{C}_{1,2}$ be the three orbi-structures defined in the proof of Proposition 3.3. Now assume that $\mathscr{F}_{\mathcal{C}_1}$ is P-semistable and that $\mathscr{G}_{\mathcal{C}_2}$ is not semistable with respect to P. Set $G_{\alpha\beta} := \mathrm{Gal}(Z^\circ_{\alpha\beta}/U^\circ_{\alpha\beta})$. Then, the orbi-sheaf defined by $g^*_{\alpha\beta}(\mathscr{G}_\beta)$ is not semistable with respect to P. That is, for every α and β there exists a saturated, $G_{\alpha\beta}$-subsheaf $\mathscr{H}_{\alpha\beta} \subset f^{[*]}_{\alpha\beta}(\mathscr{F}_\alpha)$ such that the associated reflexive orbi-sheaf $\mathscr{H}_{\mathcal{C}_{1,2}}$ destablizes $\mathscr{G}_{\mathcal{C}_2}$ with respect to P. Now the the isomorphism $g^{[*]}_{\alpha\beta}(\mathscr{G}_\beta) \cong f^{[*]}_{\alpha\beta}(\mathscr{F}_\alpha)$ implies, thanks to [**HL10**, Thm. 4.2.15], that each $\mathscr{H}_{\alpha\beta}$ descends to X_α, i.e. there is a reflexive subsheaf $\mathscr{H}_\alpha \subset \mathscr{F}_\alpha$ on X_α such that

$$f^{[*]}_{\alpha\beta}(\mathscr{H}_\alpha) \cong \mathscr{H}_{\alpha\beta}.$$

Let $\mathscr{H}_{\mathcal{C}_1}$ be the orbi-sheaf defined by $\{\mathscr{H}_\alpha\}$. As the two orbi-sheaves $\mathscr{H}_{\mathcal{C}_{1,2}}$ and $\mathscr{H}_{\mathcal{C}_1}$ are compatible, it follows from Proposition 3.3 that $\mathscr{H}_{\mathcal{C}_1}$ destabilizes $\mathscr{F}_{\mathcal{C}_1}$, a contradiction. □

3.2. The second Chern class of a pair (X, D). — In this section, we explain how to define the second Chern class of a mildly singular pair (X, D).

***Notation 2* (Orbi-Chern classes of pairs).** — *Let $J = \{\mathcal{C}_i\}$ be the collection of smooth, strict, orbi-structures for a given pair (X, D). Assume that J contains an étale orbi-structure so that $c_2(\Omega^{[1]}_{(\mathcal{C}_i,D)})$, $c_1^2(\Omega^{[1]}_{(\mathcal{C}_i,D)})$ are independent of the choice of i. We define $c_2(X, D) := c_2(\Omega^{[1]}_{(\mathcal{C}_i,D)})$ and $c_1^2(X, D) := c_1^2(\Omega^{[1]}_{(\mathcal{C}_i,D)})$.*

Thanks to Corollary 2.11, one can define without ambiguity the second Chern class of any pair (X, D) that satisfies the assumptions of Theorem B. Indeed, the existence of smooth covers make it possible to define the second Chern class while the orbi-étalité of these covers coupled with Proposition 3.3 guarantees that this definition is independent of the choice of a smooth structure.

***Example 3.5* (The log smooth reduced case).** — If (X, D) is log smooth and D is reduced, then one can check from residue exact sequence that $c_2(X, D) = c_2(\Omega_X) + K_X \cdot D + c_2(\mathcal{O}_D)$. If we write $D = \sum D_i$ its decomposition into irreducible components, then $c_2(\mathcal{O}_D) = \sum_i D_i^2 + \sum_{i<j} D_i \cdot D_j = D^2 - \sum_{i<j} D_i \cdot D_j$.

***Example 3.6* (The general log smooth case).** — If (X, D) is log smooth with coefficients in $[0, 1] \cap \mathbb{Q}$ and $D = \sum(1 - \frac{b_i}{a_i})D_i$ is its decomposition into irreducible components, then (X, D) admits a smooth orbi-étale structure (defined over the whole X). In particular, one can define $c_1(X, D)$ and $c_2(X, D)$; let us check that one recovers the classical classes, cf e.g. [**Tia94**].
Given a (local) orbi-étale cover $f : Y \to (X, D)$, we have an exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow \Omega^{[1]}_{(Y,f,D)} \longrightarrow f^*\Omega_X(\log \ulcorner D \urcorner) \longrightarrow \bigoplus_i \mathcal{O}_{b_i \widetilde{D}_i} \longrightarrow 0 \tag{3.1}$$

where $\widetilde{D}_i$ is the reduced inverse image of D_i and the sum runs over all indexes i such that $a_i \neq +\infty$. It follows from the proof of [**Mum83**, Thm. 3.1] that the $(n-1)$-cycle associated with $c_1(\mathcal{O}_{b_i \widetilde{D}_i})$ under the isomorphism (2.3) is given by $\frac{p_i}{q_i} D_i$. Under that same isomorphism, one gets

$$c_1\Big(\bigoplus_i \mathcal{O}_{b_i \widetilde{D}_i}\Big) = \sum_i \frac{b_i}{a_i} D_i$$

From the exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_Y(-b_i D_i) \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_Y \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_{b_i D_i} \longrightarrow 0$$

one gets that the $(n-2)$-cycle associated with $c_2(\mathcal{O}_{b_i \widetilde{D}_i})$ is given by $\left(\frac{b_i}{a_i}\right)^2 D_i^2$ and therefore

$$c_2\Big(\bigoplus_i \mathcal{O}_{b_i \widetilde{D}_i}\Big) = \sum_{i<j} \frac{b_i}{a_i} \frac{b_j}{a_j} D_i \cdot D_j + \sum_i \left(\frac{b_i}{a_i}\right)^2 D_i^2$$

The vector bundle in the middle of the exact sequence 3.1 is simply the differentials with logarithmic pole along the whole divisor (this sheaf is already defined on X) so its Chern classes can be computed downstairs, and from Example 3.5 above, one has $c_1(\Omega_X(\log \ulcorner D \urcorner)) = c_1(\Omega_X) + \ulcorner D \urcorner$ and

$$c_2(\Omega_X(\log \ulcorner D \urcorner)) = c_2(\Omega_X) + c_1(\Omega_X)\cdot \sum D_i + \sum_{i<j} D_i \cdot D_j + \sum_i D_i^2$$

where in the previous sums, i runs over *all* indexes. Putting everything together we find respectively:

$$\begin{aligned} c_1(X,D) &= c_1(f^*\Omega_X(\log \ulcorner D \urcorner)) - c_1\big(\bigoplus_i \mathcal{O}_{b_i \widetilde{D}_i}\big) \\ &= c_1(\Omega_X) + \ulcorner D \urcorner - \sum_i \frac{b_i}{a_i} D_i \\ &= c_1(\Omega_X) + D \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} c_2(X,D) &= c_2(f^*\Omega_X(\log \ulcorner D \urcorner)) - c_2\big(\bigoplus_i \mathcal{O}_{b_i \widetilde{D}_i}\big) - c_1(X,D)\cdot c_1\big(\bigoplus_i \mathcal{O}_{b_i \widetilde{D}_i}\big) \\ &= c_2(\Omega_X) + c_1(\Omega_X)\cdot \sum D_i + \sum_{i<j} D_i\cdot D_j + \sum_i D_i^2 - \sum_{i<j} \frac{b_i}{a_i}\frac{b_j}{a_j} D_i \cdot D_j - \\ &\quad \sum_i \Big(\frac{b_i}{a_i}\Big)^2 D_i^2 - (c_1(\Omega_X) + D)\cdot \sum_i \frac{b_i}{a_i} D_i \\ &= c_2(\Omega_X) + c_1(\Omega_X)\cdot D + \sum_{i<j} \Big(1 - \frac{b_i}{a_i}\frac{b_j}{a_j} - \Big[\big(1-\frac{b_j}{a_j}\big)\cdot \frac{b_i}{a_i} + \big(1-\frac{b_i}{a_i}\big)\cdot \frac{b_j}{a_j}\Big]\Big) D_i \cdot D_j + \\ &\quad \sum_i \Big(1 - \Big(\frac{b_i}{a_i}\Big)^2 - \big(1-\frac{b_i}{a_i}\big)\cdot \frac{b_i}{a_i}\Big) D_i^2 \\ &= c_2(\Omega_X) + c_1(\Omega_X)\cdot D + \sum_{i<j} \big(1-\frac{b_i}{a_i}\big)\big(1-\frac{b_j}{a_j}\big) D_i\cdot D_j + \sum_i \big(1-\frac{b_i}{a_i}\big) D_i^2 \end{aligned}$$

The next example shows that unlike $c_1(X,D)$, the second Chern class $c_2(X,D)$ does not only depend from the class of linear equivalence of D, so that one needs to be very careful when one modifies the divisor:

Example 3.7. — Let $X = \mathbb{P}^2$, let $x \in X$, let $\pi : Y = \mathrm{Bl}_x X \to X$, and let $E \subset Y$ the exceptional divisor. Choose H_1, H_2 two hyperplanes such that $x \in H_1$ and $x \notin H_2$. Let us denote by H_1' (resp. H_2') the strict transform of H_1 (resp. H_2) by π. Then one has $\pi^* H_1 = H_1' + E$ and $\pi^* H_2 = H_2'$. As $\pi^* H_2$ and $\pi^* H_1$ are linearly equivalent, the formula in Example 3.5 shows that $c_2(Y, \pi^* H_2) - c_2(Y, \pi^* H_1) = H_1' \cdot E = 1$.

3.3. Continuity of Chern numbers. — The following intuitive result shows that the approximation procedure introduced in Proposition 2.14 will not affect the properties of Chern classes. More precisely, let (X, D_m) be the klt pair from Proposition 2.14 with its orbifold structure $\mathcal{C}_m$ in codimension 2 (which is not the obvious structure associated to $D_m = D + \frac{1}{m}H$). Then we have:

Proposition 3.8. — **(Continuity of orbifold intersection numbers).** *With the notations of Proposition 2.14, the orbifold structure $\mathcal{C}_m$ for pair (X, D_m) satisfies:*

$$\begin{aligned}\lim_{m\to+\infty} c_1(X, D_m) &= c_1(X, D)\\ \lim_{m\to+\infty} c_2(X, D_m) &= c_2(X, D)\end{aligned}$$

as multilinear forms on $\mathrm{N}^1(X)^{n-1}_{\mathbb{Q}}$ and $\mathrm{N}^1(X)^{n-2}_{\mathbb{Q}}$, respectively.

Proof. — Recall that $D_m = D + \frac{1}{m}H$, and as $c_1(D_m) = c_1(K_X + D_m)$ (see, for instance, [**CKT16**, Cor. 3.9]), the first identity follows.

Now remember from (the proof) of Proposition 2.14 that the orbifold structure of $(X, D_m = D + \frac{1}{m}H)$ comes from the decomposition:

$$D_m := \underbrace{(D - \lfloor D\rfloor)}_{D^{\mathrm{orb}}} \quad + \quad (1 - \frac{1}{m}) \cdot \lfloor D\rfloor \quad + \quad (1 - \frac{m-1}{m}) \cdot A.$$

As A is very ample, one can assume that A is irreducible and not contained in any component of D. Given an open subset U contained in the locus of definition of the structure $\mathcal{C}_m$, one can choose a first cover $p : U' \to U$ which is quasi-étale and satisfies that $(U', p^*(D_m)_{\mathrm{red}})$ is log smooth. This follows from Proposition. 2.10 and Corollary 2.11. Then one chooses an orbi-étale cover $q' : V' \to U'$ with respect to $(p^*D)_{\mathrm{orb}}$. On V', the orbifold sheaf $\Omega^{[1]}_{X,D}$ has a realization and thus admits Chern classes. So taking further covers and reflexive pull-back of that sheaf will be compatible with computing Chern classes.

Now, choose a further cover $q : V \to V'$ that ramifies at order m along (the reduced inverse image of) $\lfloor D\rfloor$ and A. The composition $f := q \circ q' \circ p : V \to U$ is orbi-étale with respect to (X, D_m); let $G := \mathrm{Gal}(V/U)$. The associated G-sheaves on V will be denoted by $\mathscr{F}$ and $\mathscr{G}$. They admit the following description: $\mathscr{F}$ is the sheaf of differentials with logarithmic poles along $D' := (f^*\lfloor D\rfloor)_{\mathrm{red}}$ and zeros of order $m-1$ along $A' := (f^*A)_{\mathrm{red}}$; $\mathscr{G}$ is the sheaf of differentials with zeros of order $m-2$ along A'. As neither of these two G-sheaves is a subsheaf of the other, we consider their intersection $\mathscr{H} := \mathscr{F} \cap \mathscr{G}$; this is a G-sheaf as well which is realized as the sheaf of differentials with zeros of order $m-1$ along A'. We have the following two exact sequences:

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathscr{H} \longrightarrow \mathscr{F} \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_{D'} \longrightarrow 0 \tag{3.2}$$

and

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathscr{H} \longrightarrow \mathscr{G} \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_{A'} \longrightarrow 0 \tag{3.3}$$

By flatness of the map from the global Mumford cover to V, exact sequences on V will pull back, so we can argue on V. Moreover, as the stabilizer of D' (resp. A') under the G-action has m elements, it follows from the proof of [**Mum83**, Thm. 3.1] that the $(n-1)$-cycle associated with $c_1(\mathcal{O}_{D'})$ (resp. $c_1(\mathcal{O}_{A'})$) under the isomorphism (2.3) is given by $\frac{1}{m}\lfloor D\rfloor$ (resp. $\frac{1}{m}A$). From the usual locally free resolution of $\mathcal{O}_{D'}$

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_V(-D') \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_V \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_{D'} \longrightarrow 0$$

it follows that $c_1(\mathcal{O}_V(D'))$ (resp. $c_2(\mathcal{O}_{D'})$) corresponds to the $(n-1)$-cycle $\frac{1}{m}\lfloor D\rfloor$ (resp. the $(n-2)$-cycle $\frac{1}{m^2}\lfloor D\rfloor\cdot\lfloor D\rfloor$) on U, and similarly with A'.
It follows from the exact sequences (3.2)-(3.3) that

$$c_2(\mathscr{F})-c_2(\mathscr{G})=c_1(\mathscr{H})\cdot(c_1(\mathcal{O}_{D'})-c_1(\mathcal{O}_{A'}))+c_2(\mathcal{O}_{D'})-c_2(\mathcal{O}_{A'})$$

As $c_1(\mathscr{F})$ correspond to the cycle K_X+D on X, $c_1(\mathscr{H})$ corresponds to the $(n-1)$-cycle $K_X+D-\frac{1}{m}\lfloor D\rfloor$. So eventually one gets that the $(n-2)$-cycle on X corresponding to $c_2(\mathscr{F})-c_2(\mathscr{G})$ is given by:

$$\frac{1}{m}\left((K_X+D-\frac{1}{m}\lfloor D\rfloor)\cdot(\lfloor D\rfloor-A)\right)+\frac{1}{m^2}\left(\lfloor D\rfloor^2-A^2\right)$$

and we get the expected result by passing to the limit when $m\to+\infty$. □

4. Semistability of the orbifold tangent sheaf

4.1. Metrics with conic and cusp singularities. — Given numbers $d_1,\dots,d_k\in(0,1)$ and a number $k\leqslant p\leqslant n$ one can consider for $\mathbb{D}=\{z\in\mathbb{C}:|z|<1\}$ the following model Kähler metric on $(\mathbb{D}^*)^p\times\mathbb{D}^{n-p}$:

$$\omega_{\mathrm{mod}}=\sum_{j=1}^{k}\frac{idz_j\wedge d\bar{z}_j}{|z_j|^{2(1-d_j)}}+\sum_{j=k+1}^{p}\frac{idz_j\wedge d\bar{z}_j}{|z_j|^2\log^2|z_j|^2}+\sum_{j>p}idz_j\wedge d\bar{z}_j \tag{4.1}$$

The metric ω_{mod} is called the standard metric with mixed conic and cusp singularities along $D:=\sum_{j=1}^{k}(1-d_j)[z_j=0]+\sum_{j=k+1}^{p}[z_j=0]$. It has cone singularities with cone angles $2\pi d_j$ along $[z_j=0]$ for $1\leqslant j\leqslant k$ and cusp singularities along $[z_j=0]$ for $k+1\leqslant j\leqslant p$.

Now, if X is a Kähler manifold and $D=\sum_i d_iD_i$ a divisor with simple normal crossings support and coefficients $d_i\in[0,1]$, one says that a Kähler metric ω on $X\smallsetminus\mathrm{supp}(D)$ has mixed conic and cusp singularities along D if for any $x\in X$ and any open set $\Omega\ni x$ endowed with local holomorphic coordinates $(z_1,\dots,z_n)$ such that the pair (Ω,D) is isomorphic to $((\mathbb{D}^*)^p\times\mathbb{D}^{n-p},\sum_{j=1}^{k}(1-d_j)[z_j=0]+\sum_{j=k+1}^{p}[z_j=0])$, there exists a constant $C>0$ such that under that isomorphism, one has

$$C^{-1}\omega_{\mathrm{mod}}\leqslant\omega\leqslant C\omega_{\mathrm{mod}}$$

on $\Omega\smallsetminus\mathrm{supp}(D)$.

Given a compact Kähler manifold X and a divisor $D=\sum_{j=1}^{p}d_jD_j$ with coefficients $d_j\in[0,1]$ and simple normal crossings support, it is easy to give examples of such metrics. Moreover, if the real cohomology class $c_1(K_X+D)\in H^2(X,\mathbb{R})$ is assumed to be Kähler (that is, it contains a Kähler metric) then there exists a unique Kähler metric ω on $X\smallsetminus\mathrm{supp}(D)$ with mixed conic and cusp singularities along D such that $\mathrm{Ric}\,\omega=-\omega$. This is the content

of [Gue14], [GP16, Thm. 6.3]. More precisely, it is shown there that any (weak) solution $\omega_X + dd^c\varphi$ of a Monge-Ampère equation of the type

$$(\omega_X + dd^c\varphi)^n = \frac{e^{\varphi+F}}{\prod_{j=1}^p |\sigma_j|^{2(1-d_j)}}\,\omega_X^n$$

has mixed conic and cusp singularities along D. Here, ω_X is a reference Kähler form on X, $F \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(X)$, and σ_j is the canonical section of D_j, measured with respect to an arbitrary smooth hermitian metric $|\cdot|$ on $\mathcal{O}_X(D_j)$ and $\varphi \in \mathcal{E}(X,\omega_X)$ is the unknown function, cf [GZ07] for the definition of the latter functional space.

Let us conclude this section by explaining how the model metric ω_{mod} from (4.1) pulls-back to ramified covers along D when D has fractional coefficients. More precisely, if one writes $d_j = 1 - b_j/a_j$ and if $\gamma : \mathbb{D}^n \to \mathbb{D}^n$ is defined by $\gamma(w_1,\dots,w_n) = (w_1^{a_1},\dots,w_k^{a_k},w_{k+1},\dots,w_n)$, then

$$\gamma^*\omega_{\mathrm{mod}} = \sum_{j=1}^k |z_j|^{2(b_j-1)} i dz_j\wedge d\bar z_j + \sum_{j=k+1}^p \frac{i dz_j\wedge d\bar z_j}{|z_j|^2\log^2|z_j|^2} + \sum_{j>p} i dz_j\wedge d\bar z_j$$

In particular, in the case where D has standard coefficients (that is, $b_j = 1$) and $\lfloor D\rfloor = 0$, $\gamma^*\omega_{\mathrm{mod}}$ is equal to the euclidian metric. One sometimes say that in that case, ω_{mod} is smooth *in the orbifold sense*.
In general though, $\gamma^*\omega_{\mathrm{mod}}$ will have zeros (and not poles anymore) along $\sum_{j=1}^k (1-d_j)[z_j = 0]$. A useful observation is that $\gamma^*\omega_{\mathrm{mod}}$ induces a continuous hermitian semipositive metric on the trivial vector bundle on $\mathbb{D}^n$ generated by

$$z_1^{1-b_1}\frac{\partial}{\partial z_1},\dots,z_k^{1-b_k}\frac{\partial}{\partial z_k}, z_{k+1}\frac{\partial}{\partial z_{k+1}},\dots,z_p\frac{\partial}{\partial z_p},\frac{\partial}{\partial z_{p+1}},\dots,\frac{\partial}{\partial z_n}$$

which is degenerate precisely along $\gamma^*\lfloor D\rfloor$.

Note that one has a similar phenomenon if instead of choosing this very particular cover, one chooses a cover of the form $w \mapsto (w_1^N,\dots,w_k^N,w_{k+1},\dots,w_n)$ where N is divisible by any of the a_j's. In that case, the pull-back of ω_{mod} by γ is equal to $\sum_{j=1}^k |z_j|^{2(Nb_j/a_j-1)} i dz_j\wedge d\bar z_j + \sum_{j=k+1}^p \frac{i dz_j\wedge d\bar z_j}{|z_j|^2\log^2|z_j|^2} + \sum_{j>p} i dz_j\wedge d\bar z_j$.

4.2. Setting. — Let (X,D) be a n-dimensional projective log canonical pair. Let us set as before $D = \sum_{i=1}^r (1-\frac{b_i}{a_i})D_i$ for some positive integers a_i, b_i satisfying $b_i < a_i$ and $(a_i,b_i) = 1$. One allows the possibility $a_i = +\infty$. One considers a strong log resolution $\pi : \widetilde X \to X$ of the pair (X,D); one can write $\pi^*D = \widetilde D + (\text{exc. div.})$ where $\widetilde D = \sum(1-b_i/a_i)\widetilde D_i$ is the strict transform of D. One has:

$$K_{\widetilde X} + \widetilde D = \pi^*(K_X + D) + E \tag{4.2}$$

where $E = \sum c_j E_j$ is a π-exceptional divisor with coefficients $c_j \geqslant -1$. Finally, let us set $N = \mathrm{lcm}\{a_i, 1\leqslant i\leqslant r\}$ and choose a sufficiently ample divisor H on $\widetilde X$; Kawamata's construction allows us to get a cover adapted to $(\widetilde X,\widetilde D)$. More precisely, one can find is a

finite morphism $\gamma : \widetilde{Y} \to \widetilde{X}$ which is a ramified Galois cover of group G and it satisfies the following properties:

1. γ is étale over the complement of $\sum_{a_i<+\infty} \widetilde{D}_i + H$;
2. The support of $\gamma^*(\widetilde{D} + H)$ has simple normal crossings
3. Near any point $y_0 \in \widetilde{Y}$, there exist a G-invariant open set $\Omega_0 \ni y_0$, a system of coordinates (w_k) centered at y_0, a system of coordinates (z_k) near $\gamma(y_0)$ and an integer $p = p(y_0)$ such that with respect to these coordinates, the map γ can be locally expressed as
$$\gamma(w_1, \dots, w_n) = (w_1^N, \dots, w_p^N, w_{p+1}, \dots, w_n)$$
where for each $1 \leqslant k \leqslant p$, $(z_k = 0)$ is a local equation (near $\gamma(y_0)$) of one of the components of $\sum_{a_i<+\infty} \widetilde{D}_i + H$.

Note that we have chosen that particular cover (with equal ramification index along all the divisors) only to simplify the notations, as any smooth adapted cover would have worked for what follows. Let us set
$$D' = \gamma^* \widetilde{D} = \sum_{a_i<+\infty} \left(N - \frac{Nb_i}{a_i} \right) \cdot D_i + \sum_{a_i=+\infty} D_i$$
and $\gamma^* H = NH'$. With these notations, the divisors D_i's and H are reduced. With these notations, the ramification divisor of γ becomes $(N-1)\sum D_i' + (N-1)H'$. By the ramification formula, one gets:
$$K_{\widetilde{Y}} + \sum \left(1 - \frac{Nb_i}{a_i} \right) D_i' = \gamma^* \left(K_{\widetilde{X}} + \widetilde{D} + \left(1 - \frac{1}{N} \right) H \right)$$
or equivalently
$$K_{\widetilde{Y}} + \sum \left(1 - \frac{Nb_i}{a_i} \right) D_i' + (1-N)H' - \gamma^* E = \gamma^* \pi^* \left(K_X + D \right)$$
To lighten notation, let us set $B = \sum d_i B_i$ where B_i is either one ot the divisors D_i' in which case $d_i := 1 - Nb_i/a_i$ or $B_i = H'$ in which case $d_i := 1 - N$. One gets a divisor B with *integral* coefficients and simple normal crossings support which satisfies $K_{\widetilde{Y}} + B = \gamma^* \pi^* \left(K_X + D \right) + \gamma^* E$. Note that neither B nor $-B$ is effective in general (unless either $\lceil D \rceil = 0$ in which case $B \leqslant 0$ or D is reduced in which case $\gamma = \mathrm{Id}_{\widetilde{X}}$ and $B = \widetilde{D} \geqslant 0$). On $\widetilde{Y}$, the orbifold tangent sheaf of the pair (X, D), formerly denoted $\mathscr{T}_{(\widetilde{X}, \gamma, D)}$ coincides with (the sheaf of sections of) the vector bundle $T_{\widetilde{Y}}(-\log B)$ defined as the locally free $\mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{Y}}$-module generated by
$$z_1^{d_1} \frac{\partial}{\partial z_1}, \dots, z_p^{d_p} \frac{\partial}{\partial z_p}, \frac{\partial}{\partial z_{p+1}}, \dots, \frac{\partial}{\partial z_n}$$
whenever B is locally given by $(z_1^{d_1} \cdots z_p^{d_p} = 0)$ – up to relabelling the coefficients d_i. In the following, one denotes by $\mathscr{T}_{\widetilde{Y}}(-\log B)$ the associated locally free sheaf on $\widetilde{Y}$.

4.3. The semistability theorem. —

***Theorem 4.1* (Semistability of orbi-tangent sheaves).** — *In the setting 4.2, assume that $K_X + D$ is nef and big. Then $\mathscr{T}_{(\widetilde{X},\gamma,D)}$ is semistable with respect to $\pi^*(K_X + D)$. Equivalently, the vector bundle $T_{\widetilde{Y}}(-\log B)$ is semistable with respect to $\gamma^*\pi^*(K_X + D)$.*

Remark 4.2. — In the course of the proof, we actually do not use the bigness assumption. However, semistability with respect to an arbitrary nef class is not a very meaningful notion.

Proof. — Let σ_i (resp. t_j) a section of $\mathcal{O}_X(\widetilde{D}_i)$ (resp. $\mathcal{O}_X(E_j)$ cutting out $\widetilde{D}_i$ (resp. E_j). One chooses smooth hermitian metrics h_i (resp. h_j) on these bundles and a Kähler form $\omega_{\widetilde{X}}$ on $\widetilde{X}$. Finally, let $\omega_X \in c_1(K_X + D)$ be a smooth form (not necessarily semipositive). Because of (4.2), there exists a smooth volume form dV on $\widetilde{X}$ such that $-\mathrm{Ric}\,(dV) + \sum_i (1 - \frac{b_i}{a_i})\Theta_{h_i}(\widetilde{D}_i) = \pi^*\omega_X + \sum_j c_j \Theta_{h_j}(E_j)$.

For $t > 0$, the cohomology class $\{pi^*\omega_X + t\omega_{\widetilde{X}}\}$ is Kähler; therefore, one can solve for any $\varepsilon > 0$ the following Monge-Ampère equation:

$$(\pi^*\omega_X + t\omega_{\widetilde{X}} + dd^c\varphi_{t,\varepsilon})^n = \frac{\prod(|t_j|^2 + \varepsilon^2)^{c_j(1-t)} e^{\varphi_{t,\varepsilon}} dV}{\prod |\sigma_i|^{2\left(1-\frac{b_i}{a_i}\right)}} \tag{4.3}$$

and obtain a Kähler current $\omega_{t,\varepsilon} := \pi^*\omega_X + t\omega_{\widetilde{X}} + dd^c\varphi_{t,\varepsilon}$ that is smooth outside $\mathrm{Supp}(\widetilde{D})$ and has mixed conic and cusp singularities along $\widetilde{D}$ – with cone angles $\frac{2\pi b_i}{a_i}$ along $\widetilde{D}_i$ if $a_i < +\infty$, or cusp singularities along $\widetilde{D}_i$ otherwise. This follows from [**GP16**, Thm 6.3], as explained in §4.1.

Moreover, $\omega_{t,\varepsilon}$ is an approximation of the Kähler-Einstein metric in the sense that:

$$\mathrm{Ric}\,\omega_{t,\varepsilon} = -\omega_{t,\varepsilon} + t\omega_{\widetilde{X}} - ((1-t)\Theta_\varepsilon + t\Theta(E)) + [\widetilde{D}] \tag{4.4}$$

where $\Theta_\varepsilon := \sum_j c_j \left(\frac{\varepsilon^2 |D' t_j|^2}{(|t_j|^2+\varepsilon^2)^2} + \frac{\varepsilon^2 \Theta_{h_j}(E_j)}{|t_j|^2+\varepsilon^2} \right)$ is an approximation of $[E]$, the current of integration along E and $\Theta(E) := \sum_j c_j \Theta_{h_j}(E_j)$. The reason we change c_j into $(1-t)c_j$ is to prevent $\varphi_{t,\varepsilon}$ to get unbounded along $\sum_{c_j=-1} E_j$ when $\varepsilon \to 0$, $t > 0$ being fixed. Pulling back $\omega_{t,\varepsilon}$ by γ, one gets a positive current $\gamma^*\omega_{t,\varepsilon}$ which satisfies:

1. $\gamma^*\omega_{t,\varepsilon}$ is smooth outside $\mathrm{Supp}(D' + H') = \mathrm{Supp}(B)$.
2. $\gamma^*\omega_{t,\varepsilon}$ has cone angles $\frac{2\pi N p_i}{q_i}$ along D'_i (if $q_i < +\infty$) and $2\pi N$ along H'; and $\gamma^*\omega_{t,\varepsilon}$ has cusp singularities along $\lceil D' \rceil$.
3. $\mathrm{Ric}\,(\gamma^*\omega_{t,\varepsilon}) = -\gamma^*\omega_{t,\varepsilon} + t\gamma^*\omega_{\widetilde{X}} - (1-t)\gamma^*\Theta_\varepsilon - t\gamma^*\Theta(E) - [B]$.

This is a consequence of the third property of the Kawamata cover γ recalled above, cf last paragraph of §4.1. Let us recall what Item 2 means. Denoting D'_- (resp. D'_+) the union of components of D' with negative (resp. positive) coefficients and choosing a chart

$\Omega \subset \widetilde{Y}$ along with local coordinates $(z_1, \dots, z_n)$ for which $D'_- \cup H' = (z_1 \cdots z_p = 0)$ and $D'_+ = (z_{p+1} \cdots z_r = 0)$, then $\gamma_{t,\varepsilon}$ is quasi-isometric (on Ω) to the model metric below:

$$\sum_{k=1}^{p} |z_k|^{-2d_k} i dz_k \wedge d\bar{z}_k + \sum_{k=p+1}^{r} \frac{i dz_k \wedge d\bar{z}_k}{|z_k|^2 \log^2 \frac{1}{|z_k|^2}} + \sum_{k=r+1}^{n} i dz_k \wedge d\bar{z}_k \tag{4.5}$$

Recall that for $1 \leqslant k \leqslant p$ one has $d_k \leqslant 0$ so that the model metric above has *zeros* along $D'_- \cup H$ and "*poles*" along D'_+.

From now on, one will set $\omega := \gamma^* \omega_{t,\varepsilon}$. Because of 1-3, ω induces a bounded hermitian metric on $T_{\widetilde{Y}}(-\log B)$ which is smooth outside $\mathrm{Supp}(B)$. The strategy is to use this metric to derive the semistability property of the bundle; it is inspired from [**CP14**] and [**Gue16**].

If $\mathscr{F}$ is a reflexive subsheaf of $\mathscr{T}_{\widetilde{Y}}(-\log B)$ or rank p, then it induces a generically injective map of sheaves $(\Lambda^p \mathscr{F})^{**} \longrightarrow \Lambda^p \mathscr{T}_{\widetilde{Y}}(-\log B)$. Setting $L := (\Lambda^p \mathscr{F})^{**}$ to be the determinant of $\mathscr{F}$, one gets a non-zero section u of $\Lambda^p \mathscr{T}_{\widetilde{Y}}(-\log B) \otimes L^{-1}$. As ω is smooth (and Kähler) outside $\mathrm{Supp}(B)$, it induces a smooth hermitian metric h on the vector bundle $T_{\widetilde{Y}}(-\log B)$ on that locus. Let us choose some fixed smooth metric h_L on L. This enables one to compute the squared norm $|u|^2$ of the section u with respect to $h \otimes h_L^{-1}$; this is a bounded function on $\widetilde{Y}$. In order to apply the vector bundle version of Lelong-Poincaré formula to $dd^c \log |u^2|_{h \otimes h_L^{-1}}$, one needs some additional regularization processes.

First, as $|u|^2$ may not be smooth along $\mathrm{Supp}(B)$, one introduces $(\chi_\eta)_{\eta>0}$ a family of cut-off functions for $\mathrm{Supp}(B)$; one can arrange that the L^1 norm of $dd^c \chi_\eta$ (computed with respect a smooth metric on $\widetilde{Y}$) tends to zero when $\eta \to 0$, cf e.g. [**CGP13**, §9]. Then to prevent $\log |u|^2$ from being unbounded (below), one chooses a constant $\lambda > 0$, and evaluate the smooth quantity (outside $\mathrm{Supp}(B)$):

$$dd^c \log(|u|^2+\lambda^2) = \frac{1}{|u|^2+\lambda^2} \left(|D'u|^2 - \frac{|\langle D'u, u\rangle|^2}{|u|^2+\lambda^2} - \langle \Theta_{h \otimes h_L^{-1}}(\Lambda^p T_{\widetilde{Y}}(-\log B) \otimes L^{-1}) u, u \rangle \right) \tag{4.6}$$

Here, D' is the $(1,0)$-part of the Chern connection of $h \otimes h_L^{-1}$ and for a (vector-valued) $(1,0)$-form α, one uses the notation $|\alpha|^2 := \alpha \wedge \bar{\alpha}$. Outside the support of B, one can identify $T_{\widetilde{Y}}(-\log B)$ with $T_{\widetilde{Y}}$; moreover, one will identify in the following $\Theta_h(\Lambda^p T_{\widetilde{Y}})$ with $\Theta_h(\Lambda^p T_{\widetilde{Y}}) \otimes \mathrm{Id}_{L^{-1}}$. Finally, as $|\langle D'u, u\rangle|^2 \leqslant |D'u|^2 \cdot |u|^2$, one deduces from the equality (4.6) above:

$$dd^c \log(|u|^2+\lambda^2) \geqslant \frac{|u|^2}{|u|^2+\lambda^2} \left(\Theta_{h_L}(L) - \frac{\langle \Theta_h(\Lambda^p T_{\widetilde{Y}}) u, u\rangle}{|u|^2} \right) \tag{4.7}$$

Wedge inequality (4.7) with $\chi_\eta \, \omega^{n-1}$ and integrate on $\widetilde{Y}$:

$$-\int_{\widetilde{Y}} \log(|u|^2+\lambda^2) \, dd^c \chi_\eta \wedge \omega^{n-1} \geqslant \int_{\widetilde{Y}} \frac{\chi_\eta |u|^2}{|u|^2+\lambda^2} \left(\Theta_{h_L}(L) - \frac{\langle \Theta_h(\Lambda^p T_{\widetilde{Y}}) u, u\rangle}{|u|^2} \right) \wedge \omega^{n-1} \tag{4.8}$$

Recall that t, ε being fixed, ω is equivalent to the model metric given in (4.5). In particular, it follows that $\pm dd^c\chi_\eta \wedge \omega^{n-1}$ is uniformly dominated by the volume form of a metric with cusp singularities along $\mathrm{Supp}(B)$ – whose mass is finite. As χ_η converges smoothly to zero outside $\mathrm{Supp}(B)$, Lebesgue's dominated convergence theorem shows that the left hand side converges to 0 when η tends to 0, $\lambda > 0$ being fixed. By the same token, the first integral in the right hand side converges to $\int_{\widetilde{Y}} \Theta_{h_L}(L) \wedge \omega^{n-1}$ when η, λ approach zero. As the potentials of ω have finite energy (cf [**Gue14**, Prop. 2.3]), this integral is nothing but the intersection number $L \cdot \{\omega\}^{n-1} = c_1(\mathscr{F}) \cdot \big(\gamma^*\pi^*(K_X + D) + t\gamma^*\{\omega_{\widetilde{X}}\}\big)$. So one is left to estimating the second integral in the right hand side.

By the symmetries of the curvature tensor, one has the following identity (outside $\mathrm{Supp}(B)$): $n\Theta_\omega(T_{\widetilde{Y}}) \wedge \omega^{n-1} = (\sharp \mathrm{Ric}\,\omega)\,\omega^n$ where $\sharp : \Omega^{0,1}_{\widetilde{Y}} \to T^{1,0}_{\widetilde{Y}}$ is the standard isomorphism induced by ω which extends to an operator $\Omega^{1,1}_{\widetilde{Y}} \to \mathrm{End}(T_{\widetilde{Y}})$. As a result,

$$n\Theta_h(\Lambda^p T_{\widetilde{Y}}) \wedge \omega^{n-1} = (\sharp \mathrm{Ric}\,\omega)^{\wedge p}\,\omega^n$$

where for any endomorphism f of an n-dimensional vector space V, one defines $f^{\wedge p} : \Lambda^p V \to \Lambda^p V$ by $f^{\wedge p}(v_1 \wedge \ldots \wedge v_p) := \sum_{k=1}^p v_1 \wedge \ldots \wedge v_{k-1} \wedge f(v_k) \wedge v_{k+1} \wedge \ldots \wedge v_n$. These two operations preserve positivity (of $(1,1)$ forms and hermitian endomorphisms respectively). Moreover, it is easily checked that for any $(1,1)$-form α, one has $\mathrm{tr}_{\mathrm{End}}(\sharp\alpha) = \mathrm{tr}_\omega \alpha$, and if f is any positive semidefinite endomorphism of V, then $\mathrm{tr}_{\mathrm{End}}(f^{\wedge p}) \leqslant \binom{n}{p} \mathrm{tr}_{\mathrm{End}}(f)$.

Thanks to item (iii) in the properties of $\omega = \gamma^*\omega_{t,\varepsilon}$ one sees that outside $\mathrm{Supp}(B)$,

$$(\sharp \mathrm{Ric}\,\omega)^{\wedge p} = -p\mathrm{Id}_{\Lambda^p T_{\widetilde{Y}}} + t\sharp\gamma^*(\omega_{\widetilde{X}})^{\wedge p} - (1-t)(\sharp\gamma^*\Theta_\varepsilon)^{\wedge p} - t\sharp\gamma^*(\Theta(E))^{\wedge p}$$

Let $\omega_{\widetilde{Y}}$ be a reference Kähler form on $\widetilde{Y}$; there exists $C > 0$ such that $0 \leqslant \gamma^*\omega_{\widetilde{X}} \leqslant C\omega_{\widetilde{Y}}$, and therefore

$$\mathrm{tr}_{\mathrm{End}}(\gamma^*\omega_{\widetilde{X}})^{\wedge p}\,\omega^n \leqslant nC\binom{n}{p}\,\omega_{\widetilde{Y}} \wedge \omega^{n-1} \tag{4.9}$$

As a consequence, $\int_{\widetilde{Y}} \frac{\langle t(\sharp\gamma^*\omega_{\widetilde{X}})^{\wedge p}u, u\rangle}{|u|^2} \cdot \omega^n \leqslant tC' \int_{\widetilde{Y}} \omega_{\widetilde{Y}} \wedge \omega^{n-1}$ which is independent of ε and tends to zero when t goes to zero. The same argument shows that $\int_{\widetilde{Y}} \frac{\langle t(\sharp\gamma^*\Theta(E))^{\wedge p}u, u\rangle}{|u|^2} \cdot \omega^n$ converges to zero when ε and then t approach zero.

Furthermore, γ is generically unramified along $\mathrm{Supp}(E)$ hence γ^*E has simple normal crossings support and $\gamma^*\Theta_\varepsilon$ is a standard approximation of the current of integration along γ^*E. Write $\gamma^*E = \sum c_j E'_j$; then $\gamma^*\Theta_\varepsilon = \sum c_j(\alpha_{j,\varepsilon} + \beta_{j,\varepsilon})$ with $\alpha_{j,\varepsilon} = \frac{\varepsilon^2}{(|t'_j|^2+\varepsilon^2)^2} \cdot |D't'_j|^2$ and $\beta_{j,\varepsilon} = \frac{\varepsilon^2}{|t'_j|^2+\varepsilon^2} \cdot \gamma^*\Theta_{h_j}(E_j)$ where $t'_j = \gamma^*t_j$. Until the end of this paragraph, one will drop the indexes j and ε to lighten notation. One needs to evaluate the quantity $(\sharp(\alpha+\beta))^{\wedge p}\omega^n$. The term $(\sharp\alpha)^{\wedge p}\omega^n$ is positive and dominated by $n\binom{n}{p}\mathrm{Id}_{\Lambda^p T_{\widetilde{Y}}} \cdot \alpha \wedge \omega^{n-1}$. The term $(\sharp\beta)^{\wedge p}\omega^n$

is dominated (in norm) by $\frac{C\varepsilon^2}{|t'|^2+\varepsilon^2}\cdot \mathrm{Id}_{\Lambda^p T_{\widetilde{Y}}}\cdot \gamma^*\omega_{\widetilde{X}}\wedge\omega^{n-1}$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}\left|\frac{\langle \sharp(\alpha+\beta))^{\wedge p}u,u\rangle}{|u|^2}\right|\omega^n &\leqslant C\alpha\wedge\omega^{n-1}+\frac{C\varepsilon^2}{|t'|^2+\varepsilon^2}\cdot\gamma^*\omega_{\widetilde{X}}\wedge\omega^{n-1}\\ &= C(\alpha+\beta)\wedge\omega^{n-1}-C\beta\wedge\omega^{n-1}+\frac{C\varepsilon^2}{|t'|^2+\varepsilon^2}\cdot\gamma^*\omega_{\widetilde{X}}\wedge\omega^{n-1}\\ &\leqslant C(\alpha+\beta)\wedge\omega^{n-1}+\frac{C'\varepsilon^2}{|t'|^2+\varepsilon^2}\cdot\gamma^*\omega_{\widetilde{X}}\wedge\omega^{n-1}\end{aligned}$$

so that:

$$\int_{\widetilde{Y}}\left|\frac{\langle(\sharp\gamma^*\Theta_\varepsilon)^{\wedge p}u,u\rangle}{|u|^2}\wedge\omega^{n-1}\right|\leqslant C\int_{\widetilde{Y}}\gamma^*\Theta_\varepsilon\wedge\omega^{n-1}+C\sum_j\int_{\widetilde{Y}}\frac{\varepsilon^2}{|t'_j|^2+\varepsilon^2}\cdot\gamma^*\omega_{\widetilde{X}}\wedge\omega^{n-1}$$

As E is π-exceptional, the first integral on the right hand side equals $tE\cdot\{\omega_{\widetilde{X}}\}$; in particular, it does not depend on ε and converges to 0 when $t\to 0$. The term equals $C|G|\sum_j\int_{\widetilde{X}}\frac{\varepsilon^2}{|t_j|^2+\varepsilon^2}\cdot\omega_{\widetilde{X}}\wedge\omega_{t,\varepsilon}^{n-1}$ which converges to zero by Lemma 4.3 stated at the end of this proof.

Putting everything together, one obtains:

$$\int_{\widetilde{Y}}\frac{\chi_\eta|u|^2}{|u|^2+\lambda^2}\frac{\langle\Theta_h(\Lambda^pT_{\widetilde{Y}})u,u\rangle}{|u|^2}\wedge\omega^{n-1}=I_1+I_2+I_3$$

where:

$$I_1=-\frac{p}{n}\int_{\widetilde{Y}}\frac{\chi_\eta|u|^2}{|u|^2+\lambda^2}\omega^n,\quad I_2=\frac{t}{n}\int_{\widetilde{Y}}\frac{\chi_\eta|u|^2}{|u|^2+\lambda^2}\frac{\langle(\sharp\gamma^*(\omega_{\widetilde{X}}-\Theta(E)))^{\wedge p}u,u\rangle}{|u|^2}\wedge\omega^{n-1}$$

and

$$I_3=-\frac{1-t}{n}\int_{\widetilde{Y}}\frac{\chi_\eta|u|^2}{|u|^2+\lambda^2}\frac{\langle(\sharp\gamma^*\Theta_\varepsilon)^{\wedge p}u,u\rangle}{|u|^2}\wedge\omega^{n-1}$$

We claim that I_2 and I_3 converge to zero when ε,t go to 0, say for $\eta=\lambda=0$. More precisely, one can dominate pointwise the absolute value of the integrands of I_2 and I_3 by an (n,n)-form $\alpha_{t,\varepsilon}$ independent of both $\eta>0$ and $\lambda>0$ that satisfies $\lim_{t\to0}\lim_{\varepsilon\to0}\int_{\widetilde{Y}}\alpha_{t,\varepsilon}=0$. Dominated convergence enables to first pass to the limit when, in that order: $\eta,\lambda,\varepsilon,t$ converge to zero.

Moreover, dominated convergence show that I_1 converges to $-\frac{p}{n}\int_{\widetilde{Y}}\omega^n$ when η,λ converge to 0. As the potentials of ω have finite energy, this integral is nothing but $-\frac{p}{n}\{\omega\}^n$ and this quantity (depending on t only) converges to $-\frac{p}{n}([\gamma^*\pi^*(K_X+D)]^n)$ when $t\to0$. Combining this with (4.8), one finds:

$$n\,c_1(\mathscr{F})\cdot[\gamma^*\pi^*(K_X+D)]^{n-1}\leqslant -p\,([\gamma^*\pi^*(K_X+D)]^n)$$

Now the determinant of the dual of $T_{\widetilde{Y}}(-\log B)$ is $K_{\widetilde{Y}}+B=\gamma^*\pi^*(K_D+D)+\gamma^*E$. As E is π-exceptional, the intersection of $c_1(T_{\widetilde{Y}}(-\log B))$ with $[\gamma^*\pi^*(K_X+D)]^{n-1}$ is precisely $-([\gamma^*\pi^*(K_X+D)]^n)$, hence semistability of $T_{\widetilde{Y}}(-\log B)$ follows. □

In the course of the proof above, we used the following result:

Lemma 4.3. — *The positive current $\omega_{t,\varepsilon}$ solution of the Monge-Ampère equation (4.3) satisfies, for each fixed $t>0$ and each index j:*

$$\lim_{\varepsilon\to 0}\int_{\widetilde{X}}\frac{\varepsilon^2}{|t_j|^2+\varepsilon^2}\omega_{\widetilde{X}}\wedge\omega_{t,\varepsilon}^{n-1}=0$$

Remark 4.4. — Note that because the potentials of $\omega_{t,\varepsilon}$ are unbounded, one cannot directly use an argument based on Chern-Levine-Nirenberg inequality. Moreover, because of the conic part in (4.3), one cannot reproduce the arguments of [**Gue16**, Lem. 2.1] based on [**Gue16**, Prop. 1.1] as it would involve (among other things) having at hand a model conic/cusp metric with bisectional curvature bounded above and, as far as we know, such a metric has not yet been proved to exist.

Proof. — Let $V_\varepsilon:=\{|t_j|^2<\varepsilon\}$. One has

$$\int_{\widetilde{X}\smallsetminus V_\varepsilon}\frac{\varepsilon^2}{|t_j|^2+\varepsilon^2}\omega_{\widetilde{X}}\wedge\omega_{t,\varepsilon}^{n-1}\leqslant\varepsilon\int_{\widetilde{X}}\omega_{\widetilde{X}}\wedge\omega_{t,\varepsilon}^{n-1}$$

and this quantity is dominated by $\varepsilon\{\omega_{\widetilde{X}}\}\cdot\{\omega_{t,\varepsilon}\}^{n-1}$ which obviously converges to zero. Here we have used that because the potentials of $\omega_{t,\varepsilon}$ have finite energy, the mass of the (mixed) Monge-Ampère products of $\omega_{t,\varepsilon}$ is computed in cohomology. We are left to prove the following:

$$\lim_{\varepsilon\to 0}\int_{V_\varepsilon}\omega_{\widetilde{X}}\wedge\omega_{t,\varepsilon}^{n-1}=0 \tag{4.10}$$

The first observation is that thanks to [**GW16**, Thm. A], the potentials $\varphi_{t,\varepsilon}$ of $\omega_{t,\varepsilon}$ satisfy

$$\varphi_{t,\varepsilon}=\sum_{a_i=+\infty}-\log\log^2|\sigma_i|^2+R_{t,\varepsilon} \tag{4.11}$$

where $\sup_{\widetilde{X}}|R_{t,\varepsilon}|\leqslant C_t$ for some constant $C_t>0$ independent of ε. Moreover, one has uniform $\mathcal{C}^k$ estimates for $\varphi_{t,\varepsilon}$ on any compact subset of $\widetilde{X}\smallsetminus\operatorname{supp}(D+E)$; therefore any weak limit ψ_t of $\varphi_{t,\varepsilon}$ (when ε approaches 0) satisfies:

- ψ_t is smooth on $\widetilde{X}\smallsetminus\operatorname{supp}(D+E)$, and satisfies the following equation on that locus:

$$(\pi^*\omega_X+t\omega_{\widetilde{X}}+dd^c\psi_t)^n=\frac{\prod|t_j|^{2c_j(1-t)}e^{\psi_t}dV}{\prod|\sigma_i|^{2\left(1-\frac{b_i}{a_i}\right)}} \tag{4.12}$$

- $\sup_{\widetilde{X}}\left|\psi_t-\sum_{a_i=+\infty}-\log\log^2|\sigma_i|^2\right|<+\infty$

It follows from the second point and [**Gue14**, Prop. 2.3] that ψ_t has finite energy with respect to any Kähler form ω such that $\omega+dd^c\psi_t\geqslant 0$. In particular, the equation (4.12) is satisfied on the whole $\widetilde{X}$ (as the Monge-Ampère of ψ_t puts no mass on pluripolar sets). As (4.12) admits a unique solution (by comparison principle, cf [**BG14**, Prop. 4.1]), all sub-limits of $(\varphi_{t,\varepsilon})_{\varepsilon>0}$ when $\varepsilon\to 0$ agree, and in particular $\varphi_{t,\varepsilon}$ converges (weakly) to the solution φ_t of (4.12). We want to show that the convergence is actually strong. For that purpose, one observes that the quantity

$$I(\varphi_t,\varphi_{t,\varepsilon}):=\int_{\widetilde{X}}(\varphi_t-\varphi_{t,\varepsilon})(\mathrm{MA}(\varphi_{t,\varepsilon})-\mathrm{MA}(\varphi_t))$$

converges to zero when $\varepsilon \to 0$ thanks to Lebesgue dominated convergence theorem (by (4.11), $\varphi_t - \varphi_{t,\varepsilon}$ is uniformly bounded). By [BBE+11, Prop. 2.3], this implies that $\varphi_{t,\varepsilon}$ converges strongly to φ_t. In particular, the measures $(\omega_{\widetilde{X}} + \omega_{\varphi_{t,\varepsilon}})^n = (\omega_{\widetilde{X}} + \pi^*\omega_X + t\omega_{\widetilde{X}} + dd^c\varphi_{\varepsilon,t})^n$ converge weakly to the non-pluripolar measure $(\omega_{\widetilde{X}} + \omega_{\varphi_t})^n$ when $\varepsilon \to 0$, $t > 0$ being fixed.

Now, assume that (4.10) does not hold. As $(\omega_{\widetilde{X}} + \omega_{\varphi_{t,\varepsilon}})^n \geqslant \omega_{\widetilde{X}} \wedge \omega_{\varphi_{t,\varepsilon}}^{n-1}$, this would imply that

$$\limsup_{\varepsilon \to 0} \int_{V_\varepsilon} (\omega_{\widetilde{X}} + \omega_{\varphi_{t,\varepsilon}})^n > 0$$

In particular, denoting $M_t := \{\omega_{\widetilde{X}} + \pi^*\omega_X + t\omega_{\widetilde{X}}\}^n$, one could find $\delta > 0$ and a sequence $(\varepsilon_k)_{k \geqslant 0}$ converging to 0 such that for any $k \geqslant 0$:

$$\int_{\widetilde{X} \smallsetminus V_{\varepsilon_k}} (\omega_{\widetilde{X}} + \omega_{\varphi_{t,\varepsilon_k}})^n \leqslant M_t - \delta$$

In particular, given $k_0 \geqslant 0$, one would have for any $k \geqslant k_0$:

$$\int_{\widetilde{X} \smallsetminus V_{\varepsilon_{k_0}}} (\omega_{\widetilde{X}} + \omega_{\varphi_{t,\varepsilon_k}})^n \leqslant M_t - \delta$$

As weak convergence of measures does not increase the mass, one would find:

$$\int_{\widetilde{X} \smallsetminus V_{\varepsilon_{k_0}}} (\omega_{\widetilde{X}} + \omega_{\varphi_t})^n \leqslant M_t - \delta$$

As this holds for any $k_0 \geqslant 0$, one deduces:

$$\int_{\widetilde{X} \smallsetminus \{t_j = 0\}} (\omega_{\widetilde{X}} + \omega_{\varphi_t})^n \leqslant M_t - \delta$$

which contradicts the fact that φ_t has finite energy with respect to $(1+t)\omega_{\widetilde{X}} + \pi^*\omega_X$. Therefore (4.10) is proved, and the lemma follows. □

4.4. Proof of Theorem C. — Let $f : Y \to (X, D = \sum d_i \cdot D_i)$ be a strictly adapted morphism (note that Y is not necessarily lc) and $\pi : \widetilde{X} \to X$ a strong log-resolution for the pair (X, D). Set $\widetilde{D}$ to be the birational transform of D. Let $\widehat{Y}$ be the irreducible component of the normalization of $(Y \times_X \widetilde{X})$ inducing surjective morphisms $\widehat{\pi} : \widehat{Y} \to Y$, $\widehat{f} : \widehat{Y} \to \widetilde{X}$ and the corresponding commutative diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \widehat{Y} & \xrightarrow{\widehat{f}} & \widetilde{X} \\ \downarrow{\scriptstyle \widehat{\pi}} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \pi} \\ Y & \xrightarrow{f} & X. \end{array}$$

Note that as π is a projective birational morphism, the finite morphism $\widehat{f} : \widehat{Y} \to \widetilde{X}$ is Galois. Let $\gamma : \widetilde{Y} \to (\widetilde{X}, \widetilde{D})$ be an adapted morphism such that the two orbi-cotangent sheaves $\Omega^1_{(\widetilde{\mathcal{C}}, \widetilde{D})}$ and $\Omega^{[1]}_{(\widehat{\mathcal{C}}, \widetilde{D})}$ with respect to, respectively, the two orbi-structures $\widetilde{\mathcal{C}} := \{(\widetilde{X}, \gamma, \widetilde{Y})\}$, $\widehat{\mathcal{C}} := \{(\widetilde{X}, \widehat{f}, \widetilde{Y})\}$ are compatible.

$$\widehat{Y} \xrightarrow{\ \widehat{f}\ } \widetilde{X} \xleftarrow{\ \gamma\ } \widetilde{Y}$$

Note that existence of such $\widetilde{\mathcal{C}}$ is guaranteed by choosing γ to be an adapted morphism such that for each i, there exists a Weil divisor $B_i \subset \widetilde{Y}$ satisfying the equality $\gamma^*(\widetilde{D}_i) = a_i \cdot B_i$, where $\widehat{f}^*(\widetilde{D}_i) = a_i \cdot B_i'$ for some Weil divisor $B_i' \subset \widehat{Y}$.

Now, according to Theorem 4.1 we know that the $\Omega^{[1]}_{(\widetilde{\mathcal{C}},\widetilde{D})}$ is semistable with respect to $\pi^*(K_X + D)$. Therefore, by Proposition 3.4, so is $\Omega^{[1]}_{(\widehat{\mathcal{C}},\widetilde{D})}$. It thus follows that $\Omega^{[1]}_{(Y,f,D)}$ is semistable with respect to $(K_X + D)$. Otherwise, there exists a reflexive subsheaf $\mathscr{F} \subset \Omega^{[1]}_{(Y,f,D)}$ such that

$$\mu_{(f^*(K_X+D))}(\mathscr{F}) > \mu_{(f^*(K_X+D))}(\Omega^{[1]}_{(Y,f,D)}).$$

But then the subsheaf $\widehat{\mathscr{F}} \subset \Omega^{[1]}_{(\widehat{Y},\widehat{f},D)}$ defined by

$$\widehat{\mathscr{F}} := (\widehat{\pi}^*\mathscr{F}) \cap \Omega^{[1]}_{(Y,\widehat{f},D)},$$

which verifies the equality $\mu_{(\widehat{\pi}^*(K_X+D))}(\widehat{\mathscr{F}}) = \mu_{(f^*(K_X+D))}(\mathscr{F})$, destabilizes $\Omega^{[1]}_{(\widehat{Y},\widehat{f}\widetilde{D})}$; a contradiction.

5. Orbifold Miyaoka-Yau inequality for minimal pairs

Proof of Theorem B. Let H be the ample divisor in Proposition 2.14 and set $\mathcal{C}_m = \{(X_{\alpha_m}, f_{\alpha_m}, U_{\alpha_m})\}$ to be the smooth, orbi-structure for the klt pair (X, D_m) in codimension two.

Let $f_m : Y_m \to (X, D_m)$ be a strict adapted morphism. By Theorem C, the sheaf $\Omega^{[1]}_{(Y_m,f_m,D_m)}$ is semistable with respect to $K_X + D_m$. Now, according to Flenner's restriction theorem ([Fle84]) for sufficiently large, positive integer a_m, there is a complete intersection curve $C_m := D_1 \cap \ldots \cap D_{n-1}$, where D_i are general members of $|a_m \cdot (K_X + D_m)|$ such that $(\Omega^{[1]}_{(Y_m,f_m,D_m)}|_{C_{Y_m}})$ is semistable, where $C_{Y_m} := f_m^{-1}(C_m)$. By Proposition 3.4 it follows that $(\Omega^{[1]}_{(Y_m,f_m,D_m)}|_{C_m})$ is also semistable. In particular the restriction $\Omega^{[1]}_{(\mathcal{C}_m,D_m)}|_{S_m}$ is semistable, for $S_m := D_1 \cap \ldots \cap D_{n-2}$.

Step. 1. Construction of an orbi-Higgs stable sheaf.
Define the orbi-Higgs sheaf by $\mathscr{E}_{\mathcal{C}_m} := \Omega^{[1]}_{(\mathcal{C}_m,D_m)} \oplus \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{C}_m}$ together with the canonically defined Higgs map defined by the isomorphism:

$$\theta_{\mathcal{C}_m} : \Omega^{[1]}_{(\mathcal{C}_m,D_m)} \to \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{C}_m} \otimes \Omega^{[1]}_{(\mathcal{C}_m,D_m)},$$

where $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{C}_m}$ is the orbi-sheaf defined by $\{\mathcal{O}_{X_{\alpha_m}}\}_{\alpha_m}$.

Now, consider the restriction $\mathscr{E}_{\mathcal{C}_{S_m}} = \Omega^{[1]}_{(\mathcal{C}_m,D_m)}|_{S_m}$, where $\mathcal{C}_{S_m}$ denotes the restriction of the orbi-structure $\mathcal{C}_m$ to S_m, with the Higgs field $\theta_{\mathcal{C}_{S_m}}$ defined by

$$\theta_{\mathcal{C}_{S_m}} = \theta_{\mathcal{C}_m}|_{S_m} : \Omega^{[1]}_{(\mathcal{C}_m,D_m)}|_{S_m} \to \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{C}_{S_m}} \otimes \big(\Omega^{[1]}_{(\mathcal{C}_m,D_m)}\big)|_{S_m} \to \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{C}_{S_m}} \otimes \Omega^1_{\mathcal{C}_{S_m}}.$$

Claim 2. — *The locally free orbi-Higgs sheaf $(\mathscr{E}_{\mathcal{C}_{S_m}}, \theta_{\mathcal{C}_{S_m}})$ is Higgs stable with respect to $(K_X + D_m)|_{S_m}$.*

Proof of Claim 2. Let $\mathscr{F}_{\mathcal{C}_{S_m}} \subset \mathscr{E}_{\mathcal{C}_{S_m}}$ be an orbi-Higgs subsheaf. As there are no subsheaves of $(\Omega^{[1]}_{(\mathcal{C}_{S_m}, D_m)})|_{S_m}$ that are invariant under the Higgs operator $\theta_{\mathcal{C}_{S_m}}$, the orbi-sheaf $\mathscr{F}_{\mathcal{C}_{S_m}}$ must have a non-trivial projection onto a subsheaf $\mathscr{L}_{\mathcal{C}_{S_m}}$ of $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{C}_{S_m}}$. Let

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathscr{G}_{\mathcal{C}_{S_m}} \longrightarrow \mathscr{F}_{\mathcal{C}_{S_m}} \longrightarrow \mathscr{L}_{\mathcal{C}_{S_m}} \longrightarrow 0 \tag{5.1}$$

be the resulting exact sequence of orbi-sheaves, where $\mathscr{G}_{\mathcal{C}_{S_m}}$ is the reflexive subsheaf of $\Omega^{[1]}_{(\mathcal{C}_{S_m}, D_m)}$. The rest of our arguments are now very similar to those in [**GKPT15**, §7]. From (5.1) and the inclusion $\mathscr{L}_{\mathcal{C}_{S_m}} \subset \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{C}_{S_m}}$ it follows that

$$c_1(\mathscr{F}_{\mathcal{C}_{S_m}}) \leqslant c_1(\mathscr{G}_{\mathcal{C}_{S_m}}). \tag{5.2}$$

Let $r := \mathrm{rank}(\mathscr{F}_{\mathcal{C}_m})$. By dividing the two sides of 5.2 by $(r-1)$ we find that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mu(\mathscr{F}_{\mathcal{C}_{S_m}}) &= \mu(\mathscr{G}_{\mathcal{C}_{S_m}}) \cdot \frac{r-1}{r} \\
&\leqslant \frac{1}{n}((K_X + D_m)|_{S_m})^2 \cdot \frac{r-1}{r} \\
&< \frac{1}{n+1}((K_X + D_m)|_{S_m})^2 \\
&= \mu\big(\Omega^1_{(\mathcal{C}_{S_m}, D_m)} \oplus \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{C}_{S_m}}\big),
\end{aligned}$$

as required. □

Step. 2. The Miyaoka-Yau inequality.
Let $\gamma_m : \widehat{S}_m \to S_m$ be the global Mumford cover associated to the orbi-structure $\mathcal{C}_{S_m}$ on S_m and $G_m := \mathrm{Gal}(\widehat{S}_m / S_m)$. As $(\mathscr{E}_{\mathcal{C}_{S_m}}, \theta_{\mathcal{C}_{S_m}})$ is Higgs stable, it follows that the locally free Higgs sheaf $(\widehat{\mathscr{E}}_{\mathcal{C}_{S_m}}, \widehat{\theta}_{\mathcal{C}_{S_m}})$ on $\widehat{S}_m$ with

$$\widehat{\theta}_{\mathcal{C}_{S_m}} : \widehat{\mathscr{E}}_{\mathcal{C}_{S_m}} \to \widehat{\mathscr{E}}_{\mathcal{C}_{S_m}} \otimes \mathscr{W}_m,$$

where by construction $\mathscr{W}_m \subset \Omega^{[1]}_{\widehat{S}_m}$ is a locally free subsheaf. Set $H_{S_m} := (K_X + D_m)|_S$ and $\widehat{H}_{S_m} := (\gamma_m)^*(H_{S_m})$.

Claim 3. — *For an equivariant resolution $\pi_m : \widetilde{S}_m \to \widehat{S}_m$, there exists an ample divisor $\widetilde{H}_m \subset \widetilde{S}_m$ such that the locally free Higgs sheaf*

$$(\widetilde{\mathscr{E}}_{\mathcal{C}_{S_m}}, \widetilde{\theta}_{\mathcal{C}_{S_m}}) := (\pi_m)^*(\widehat{\mathscr{E}}_{\mathcal{C}_{S_m}}, \widehat{\theta}_{\mathcal{C}_{S_m}})$$

is Higgs G_m-stable *with respect to $\widetilde{H}_m$, that is for every Higgs, G_m-subsheaf $\widetilde{\mathscr{F}}_{\mathcal{C}_{S_m}}$ we have $\mu_{\widetilde{H}_m}(\widetilde{\mathscr{F}}_{\mathcal{C}_{S_m}}) < \mu_{\widetilde{H}_m}(\widetilde{\mathscr{E}}_{\mathcal{C}_{S_m}})$.*

Proof of Claim 3. First we notice that from the orbi-Higgs stability of $(\mathscr{E}_{\mathcal{C}_{S_m}}, \theta_{\mathcal{C}_{S_m}})$ it follows that the locally free Higgs sheaf $(\widehat{\mathscr{E}}_{\mathcal{C}_{S_m}}, \widehat{\theta}_{\mathcal{C}_{S_m}})$ is G_m-stable, i.e.

$$\mu_{\widehat{H}_m}(\widehat{\mathscr{F}}_{\mathcal{C}_{S_m}}) < \mu_{\widehat{H}_m}(\widehat{\mathscr{E}}_{\mathcal{C}_{S_m}}). \tag{5.3}$$

This is because, every such subsheaf descends to an orbi-Higgs subsheaf $(\mathscr{F}_{\mathcal{C}_{S_m}}, \theta_{\mathcal{C}_{S_m}}) \subset (\mathscr{E}_{\mathcal{C}_{S_m}}, \theta_{\mathcal{C}_{S_m}})$, i.e. $\widehat{\mathscr{F}}_{\mathcal{C}_{S_m}} = q_{\alpha_m}^{[*]}(\mathscr{F}_{\mathcal{C}_{S_m}})$, cf. [**HL10**, Thm. 4.2.15]. Here, the morphism $q_{\alpha_m} : \widehat{S}_{\alpha_m} \to S_{\alpha_m}$ factors γ_m:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \widehat{S}_{\mathcal{C}_m} & & \xrightarrow{\qquad\qquad\gamma\qquad\qquad} & & S_m \\ \uparrow & & & & \uparrow \\ \widehat{S}_{\alpha_m} & \xrightarrow{q_{\alpha_m}} & S_{\alpha_m} & \xrightarrow{p_{\alpha_m}} & V_{\alpha_m}, \end{array}$$

as defined in Subsection 2.6.2. Therefore the orbi-satbility of $(\mathscr{E}_{\mathcal{C}_{S_m}}, \theta_{\mathcal{C}_{S_m}})$ ensures that Inequality 5.3 holds. As a result, the pull-back Higgs bundle $(\widetilde{\mathscr{E}}_{\mathcal{C}_{S_m}}, \widetilde{\theta}_{\mathcal{C}_{S_m}})$ is G_m-stable with respect to $\pi^*\widehat{H}_m$.

Now, let E be an effective exceptional divisor that is relatively anti-ample. As stability is an open condition, for any sufficiently small $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{Q}^+$ we can guarantee that $\widetilde{H}_m := (\pi^*H_m - \varepsilon \cdot E)$ is ample and that $(\widetilde{\mathscr{E}}_{\mathcal{C}_{S_m}}, \widetilde{\theta}_{\mathcal{C}_{S_m}})$ is Higgs stable with respect $\widetilde{H}_m$. This finishes the proof of Claim 3.

From the original result of Simpson on the existence of HYM metrics, cf. [**Sim92**], it thus follows that $\widehat{\mathscr{E}}_{\mathcal{C}_{S_m}}$ verifies the Bogomolov-Gieseker inequality, and thus the inequality

$$\big(2(n+1)\cdot c_2(\Omega^{[1]}_{(\mathcal{C}_m, D_m)}) - n\cdot c_1^2(\Omega^{[1]}_{(\mathcal{C}_m, D_m)})\big)\cdot (K_X + D + \frac{1}{m}\cdot H)^{n-2} \geqslant 0 \tag{5.4}$$

holds for all $m \geqslant 2$. The inequality in Theorem A. now immediately follows from (5.4) by taking the limit $m \to \infty$, using the continuity property in Proposition 3.8. This finishes the proof of Theorem B, cases (i)-(ii).

For Theorem B, case (iii) notice that the proof above only uses the existence of a smooth orbi-étale structure in codimension two for (X, D) as well as for (X, D_m). Both of these conditions are satisfied for a log smooth lc pair (X, D). In particular, in view of Example 3.6, one has for any log smooth lc pair (X, D) with $K_X + D$ nef and big, say:

$$\big(2(n+1)\cdot c_2(X, D) - n\cdot c_1^2(X, D)\big)\cdot (K_X + D)^{n-2} \geqslant 0$$

where $c_2(X, D) = c_2(\Omega_X) + c_1(\Omega_X)\cdot D + \sum_{i<j}\big(1 - \frac{b_i}{a_i}\big)\big(1 - \frac{b_j}{a_j}\big)D_i\cdot D_j + \sum_i \big(1 - \frac{b_i}{a_i}\big)D_i^2$.

References

[Aub78] T. Aubin – "Équations du type Monge-Ampère sur les variétés kählériennes compactes", *Bull. Sci. Math. (2)* **102** (1978), no. 1, p. 63–95.

[BBE+11] R. J. Berman, S. Boucksom, P. Eyssidieux, V. Guedj & A. Zeriahi – "Kähler-Einstein metrics and the Kähler-Ricci flow on log-Fano varieties", *arXiv:1111.7158v2* (2011).

[BG14] R. J. Berman & H. Guenancia – "Kähler-Einstein metrics on stable varieties and log canonical pairs", *Geometric and Function Analysis* **24** (2014), no. 6, p. 1683–1730.

[CGP13] F. Campana, H. Guenancia & M. Păun – "Metrics with cone singularities along normal crossing divisors and holomorphic tensor fields", *Ann. Scient. Éc. Norm. Sup.* **46** (2013), p. 879–916.

[CKT16] B. Claudon, S. Kebekus & B. Taji – "Generic positivity and applications to hyperbolicity of moduli spaces", Preprint arXiv:1610.09832, October 2016.

[CP14] F. Campana & M. Păun – "Positivity properties of the bundle of logarithmic tensors on compact Kähler manifolds", *arXiv:1407.3431* (2014).

[Fle84] H. Flenner – "Restrictions of semistable bundles on projective varieties", *Comment. Math. Helv.* **59** (1984), no. 4, p. 635–650, DOI: 10.1007/BF02566370.

[GKKP11] D. Greb, S. Kebekus, S. J. Kovács & T. Peternell – "Differential forms on log canonical spaces", *Publ. Math. Inst. Hautes Études Sci.* (2011), no. 114, p. 87–169.

[GKPT15] D. Greb, S. Kebekus, T. Peternell & B. Taji – "The Miyaoka-Yau inequality and uniformisation of canonical models", Preprint arXiv:1511.08822, November 2015.

[GP16] H. Guenancia & M. Păun – "Conic singularities metrics with prescribed Ricci curvature: the case of general cone angles along normal crossing divisors", *J. Differential Geom.* **103** (2016), no. 1, p. 15–57.

[Gue14] H. Guenancia – "Kähler-Einstein metrics with mixed Poincaré and cone singularities along a normal crossing divisor", *Ann. Inst. Fourier* **64** (2014), no. 6, p. 1291–1330.

[Gue16] ———, "Semistability of the tangent sheaf of singular varieties", *Algebraic Geometry* **3** (2016), no. 5, p. 508–542.

[GW16] H. Guenancia & D. Wu – "On the boundary behavior of Kähler-Einstein metrics on log canonical pairs", *Math. Annalen* **366** (2016), no. 1, p. 101–120.

[GZ07] V. Guedj & A. Zeriahi – "The weighted Monge-Ampère energy of quasi plurisubharmonic functions", *J. Funct. An.* **250** (2007), p. 442–482.

[HL10] D. Huybrechts & M. Lehn – *The geometry of moduli spaces of sheaves. 2nd ed.*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.

[JMR16] T. Jeffres, R. Mazzeo & Y. A. Rubinstein – "Kähler-Einstein metrics with edge singularities", *Ann. of Math. (2)* **183** (2016), no. 1, p. 95–176, with an Appendix by C. Li and Y. Rubinstein.

[K+92] J. Kollár et al. – *Flips and abundance for algebraic threefolds*, Société Mathématique de France, Paris, 1992, Papers from the Second Summer Seminar on Algebraic Geometry held at the University of Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah, August 1991, Astérisque No. 211 (1992).

[Kaw92] Y. Kawamata – "Abundance theorem for for minimal threefolds", *Invent. Math* **108** (1992), p. 229–246.

[KM98] J. Kollár & S. Mori – *Birational geometry of algebraic varieties*, Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics, vol. 134, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1998, With the collaboration of C. H. Clemens and A. Corti, Translated from the 1998 Japanese original.

[Kob84] R. Kobayashi – "Kähler-Einstein metric on an open algebraic manifolds", *Osaka 1. Math.* **21** (1984), p. 399–418.

[Kol97] J. Kollár – "Singularities of pairs", in *Algebraic geometry—Santa Cruz 1995*, Proc. Sympos. Pure Math., vol. 62, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1997, p. 221–287.

[Laz04a] R. Lazarsfeld – *Positivity in algebraic geometry. I*, Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete. 3. Folge. A Series of Modern Surveys in Mathematics [Results in Mathematics and Related Areas. 3rd Series. A Series of Modern Surveys in Mathematics], vol. 48, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2004, Classical setting: line bundles and linear series.

[Laz04b] ———, *Positivity in algebraic geometry. II*, Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete. 3. Folge. A Series of Modern Surveys in Mathematics [Results in Mathematics and Related Areas. 3rd Series. A Series of Modern Surveys in Mathematics], vol. 49, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2004, Positivity for vector bundles, and multiplier ideals.

[Mum83] D. Mumford – "Towards an enumerative geometry of the moduli space of curves", in *Arithmetic and geometry, Vol. II*, Progr. Math., vol. 36, Birkhäuser Boston, Boston, MA, 1983, p. 271–328.

[Sim92] C. T. Simpson – "Higgs bundles and local systems", *Inst. Hautes Études Sci. Publ. Math.* **75** (1992), p. 5–95.

[SW16] J. Song & X. Wang – "The greatest Ricci lower bound, conical Einstein metrics and Chern number inequality", *Geom. Topol.* **20** (2016), no. 1, p. 49–102.

[Tia94] G. Tian – "Kähler-Einstein metrics on algebraic manifolds", in *Transcendental methods in Algebraic Geometry*, Lecture Notes of the C.I.M.E, 1994.

[Tsu88] H. Tsuji – "Existence and degeneration of Kähler-Einstein metrics on minimal algebraic varieties of general type", *Math. Ann.* **281** (1988), no. 1, p. 123–133.

[TY87] G. Tian & S.-T. Yau – "Existence of Kähler-Einstein metrics on complete Kähler manifolds and their applications to algebraic geometry", *Adv. Ser. Math. Phys. 1* **1** (1987), p. 574–628, Mathematical aspects of string theory (San Diego, Calif., 1986).

[Yau78] S.-T. Yau – "On the Ricci curvature of a compact Kähler manifold and the complex Monge-Ampère equation. I.", *Commun. Pure Appl. Math.* **31** (1978), p. 339–411.

[Zha09a] Y. Zhang – "Miyaoka-Yau inequality for minimal projective manifolds of general type", *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **137** (2009), no. 8, p. 2749–2754, DOI: 10.1090/S0002-9939-09-09838-4.

[Zha09b] Z. Zhang – "Scalar curvature bound for Kähler-Ricci flows over minimal manifolds of general type", *Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN* (2009), no. 20, p. 3901–3912.

November 21, 2016

Henri Guenancia, Department of Mathematics, Stony Brook University, Stony Brook, NY 11794-3651 USA • *E-mail :* guenancia@math.sunysb.edu • *Url :* http://www.math.sunysb.edu/~guenancia

Behrouz Taji, Behrouz Taji, Northwestern University, Department of Mathematics, 2033 Sheridan Road, Evanston, IL 60208-2730 USA and Mathematisches Institut, Albert Ludwigs University of Freiburg, Eckerstr. 1, 79104 Freiburg im Breisgau, Germany. • *E-mail :* behrouz.taji@northwestern.edu *Url :* http://www.math.northwestern.edu/~taji/